arXiv:math/0409591v2 [math.AC] 7 Oct 2004

REPRESENTATIONS OF MATROIDS AND FREE RESOLUTIONS FOR MULTIGRADED MODULES

ALEXANDRE B. TCHERNEV

ABSTRACT. Let $\Bbbk$ be a field, let $R = \Bbbk[x_1, \dots, x_m]$ be a polynomial ring with the standard $\mathbb{Z}^m$-grading (multigrading), let L be a Noetherian multigraded R-module, and let $E \xrightarrow{\Phi} G \to L \to 0$ be a finite free multigraded presentation of L over R. Given a choice S of a multihomogeneous basis of E, we construct an explicit canonical finite free multigraded resolution $T_\bullet(\Phi, S)$ of the R-module L. In the case of monomial ideals our construction recovers the Taylor resolution. A main ingredient of our work is a new linear algebra construction of independent interest, which produces from a representation ϕ over $\Bbbk$ of a matroid $\mathbf{M}$ a canonical finite complex of finite dimensional $\Bbbk$-vector spaces $T_\bullet(\phi)$ that is a resolution of $\operatorname{Ker}\phi$. We also show that the length of $T_\bullet(\phi)$ and the dimensions of its components are combinatorial invariants of the matroid $\mathbf{M}$, and are independent of the representation map ϕ.

CONTENTS

Introduction 2
1. Matroids 5
1.1. Basics 5
1.2. Minors, duality, connected components 5
1.3. Representations 6
1.4. Group actions 7
2. T-flats 8
3. Multiplicity spaces, T-spaces, diagonal maps 9
4. The homomorphisms ϕ_n^{IJ} 12
5. The definition of $T_\bullet(\phi)$ and $T_\bullet(\phi)^+$ 16
6. The main properties of $T_\bullet(\phi)$ and $T_\bullet(\phi)^+$ 17
7. Free resolutions of multigraded modules 19
8. T-flats of minors 22
9. The structure of the T-parts of a T-flat 24
10. Connected T-flats and multiplicity spaces 28
11. Multiplicity spaces for minors 30
12. $T_\bullet(\phi)$ and $T_\bullet(\phi)^+$ are complexes 32
13. The definition of $(\pi.Y)^\phi_\bullet\colon\ T_\bullet(\phi.Y) \longrightarrow T_\bullet(\phi)$ 39
14. $(\pi.Y)^\phi_\bullet$ is a morphism of complexes 41
15. Acyclicity 46
16. Appendix on matroids 49
References 52

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 13D02 (Primary) 13A02, 52B40, 52C35 (Secondary).
Key words and phrases. multigraded, free resolution, matroid, matroid representation.

Introduction

In her thesis [15], Diana Taylor constructs an explicit finite free resolution for an arbitrary monomial ideal. Even though the Taylor resolution is generally nonminimal, its canonical combinatorial description has turned this construction into one of the main tools in the study of the homological structure and combinatorics of monomial ideals. It is therefore a natural and important question whether a similarly explicit construction exists in the more general setting of multigraded modules. The difficulty of studying resolutions of mutigraded modules is apparent from the fact that most of the published work in this area deals exclusively with homological properties of monomial ideals, and until recently there were only a few general results available on the structure of free resolutions of multigraded modules that are not cyclic: Lescot [9] shows that the multigraded Poincaré series of a multigraded module is rational, the papers of Bruns and Herzog [3] and Iyengar [8] provide bounds for the shifts in a minimal multigraded resolution, and the papers of Santoni [14], Charalambous [4], and Römer [13] provide bounds for the Betti numbers of a multigraded module. In the last five years however there has been an increased interest in the study of the homological properties of multigraded modules. The papers of Yanagawa [20, 21, 22] introduce and study the class of squarefree multigraded modules. The work of Römer [12] introduced the Alexander duality functor for squarefree modules; at the same time and independently Miller [10] defined Alexander duality for arbitrary multigraded modules and used his breakthrough to exhibit the fundamental correspondence between minimal free and minimal injective resolutions of multigraded modules. These results provide a wonderful insight into the homological structure of multigraded modules, and they also make the problem of finding an explicit construction for free resolutions even more interesting because a solution would automatically provide via Alexander duality an explicit construction for injective resolutions. Along the lines of explicit constructions, Bayer and Sturmfels [1] provide a resolution for infinitely generated co-Artinian monomial modules, Charalambous and Deno [5] compute the module of second syzygies in a minimal free presentation of a Noetherian multigraded module, while Charalambous and Tchernev [6] introduce the notion of a generic Noetherian multigraded module and construct explicitly the entire minimal free resolution of such a module.

The main goal of this paper is to address the still remaining question on the existence of an explicit free resolution for an arbitrary Noetherian multigraded module, and to answer it in the affirmative. The principal tool for achieving such an explicit description is a new construction of a complex of vector spaces that lies at the crossroads of matroid theory and multilinear algebra, and has the potential for applications to both of these fields, as well as to other areas such as group representation theory. The properties of this new complex give a strong indication that there are two main combinatorial ingredients determining the structure of the minimal free resolution of a Noetherian multigraded module L. The first ingredient is, as expected from the case of monomial ideals, the combinatorics of the multidegrees of a (fixed) set of minimal generators of the first syzygy module of L. The second ingredient, which is new but probably not very surprising, are the combinatorial properties of the matroid asociated with this fixed set of minimal generators. What is surprising however, is that our construction makes it possible to obtain an explicit description of the interaction between these two ingredients; a detailed investigation of this interaction in a generic situation is carried out in [7].

To describe the results of the present article in more detail, let $\Bbbk$ be a field, let W be a finite dimensional $\Bbbk$-vector space, let S be a finite set, let U_S be the $\Bbbk$-vector space with basis the set of symbols $\{e_a \mid a \in S\}$, and let $\phi\colon\ U_S \longrightarrow W$ be a vector space homomorphism. We construct in a canonical way a finite complex $T_\bullet(\phi)$ of finite dimensional $\Bbbk$-vector spaces that we call *the T-complex of* ϕ. The length of this complex and the ranks of the vector spaces in it depend only on the matroid $\mathbf{M}$ on S that is represented by the map ϕ, and not on the actual map ϕ. The T-complex $T_\bullet(\phi)$ behaves very well with respect to the operations contraction and restriction of matroids, and the first main result of this paper, Theorem 6.5, states that this complex is a resolution of the kernel $\mathrm{Ker}(\phi)$.

In the process of defining $T_\bullet(\phi)$ we introduce for each subset $A \subseteq S$ a certain *multiplicity* vector space $S_A(\phi)$, which appears to capture subtle combinatorial properties of the matroid $\mathbf{M}$, and seems to be of independent interest. For example, we show in Theorem 10.5 that $S_A(\phi) \neq 0$ if and only if A is a connected dependent set in $\mathbf{M}$. Furthermore, a consequence of Theorem 6.5 is that the dimension of $S_A(\phi)$ is an invariant of the matroid $\mathbf{M}$, and is independent of the presentation ϕ. The space $S_A(\phi)$ has a natural system of generators indexed by a certain collection $C_{\mathbf{M}}(A)$ of maximal chains of flats in the dual matroid $\mathbf{M}^*$, and it is a very interesting open question whether the corresponding representable matroid on the set $C_{\mathbf{M}}(A)$ is independent of the representation map ϕ.

Next, let $R = \Bbbk[x_1, \ldots, x_m]$ be a polynomial ring with the usual $\mathbb{Z}^m$-grading (multigrading), let L be a multigraded Noetherian R-module, let

$$E \xrightarrow{\Phi} G \longrightarrow L \longrightarrow 0$$

be a finite free (not necessarily minimal) multigraded presentation of L over R, and let S be a multihomogeneous basis of E. Consider $\Bbbk$ as an R-module via the canonical projection $R \longrightarrow \Bbbk$ that sends each variable x_i to the identity element $1 \in \Bbbk$, and let $\phi = \Bbbk \otimes_R \Phi$. By a standard procedure we use the multidegrees of the elements in S to transform the complex of vector spaces $T_\bullet(\phi)$ into a complex of multigraded free R-modules $T_\bullet(\Phi, S)$ that we call *the T-resolution of the pair* (Φ, S). This complex is non-minimal in general, even if the presentation Φ is minimal. Its length, and the ranks of the free modules in $T_\bullet(\Phi, S)$ are completely determined by the rank of L and by the matroid $\mathbf{M}(\Phi, S)$ on the set S represented by the map ϕ. When the matroid $\mathbf{M}(\Phi, S)$ is a uniform matroid, the complex $T_\bullet(\Phi, S)$ is canonically isomorphic to the Buchsbaum-Rim-Taylor complex from [6]; in particular we recover the usual Taylor resolution of a monomial ideal. The second main result of this paper, Theorem 7.5, is that the T-resolution of (Φ, S) is always a free multigraded resolution of the R-module L.

It should be emphasized that different choices for the basis S produce in general nonisomorphic matroids $\mathbf{M}(\Phi, S)$, and also nonisomoprhic T-resolutions. It is certainly an important open problem to analyze whether there exists an optimal choice of S, and what are the properties of a "generic" choice of S.

This paper is written from the point of view of a commutative algebraist. Thus, while we employ many concepts and results from matroid theory, an attempt has been made to have a self-contained presentation of these facts. In particular we review all relevant definitions about matroids, and we have included the proofs of all facts about matroids that appear after Section 1, even in the few cases when a reference was available in the literature. The material is organized as follows.

In the first part of the paper, Section 1 through Section 5, we introduce all the objects necessary to define the T-complex $T_\bullet(\phi)$ and its augmentation $T_\bullet(\phi)^+$. The content is mostly of definitions, and should make for a relatively easy and smooth reading. More specifically, in Section 1 we review the basic notions from matroid theory that we will need, and in Section 2 we reintroduce (under a slightly different name) the somewhat neglected in the literature notion of a T-flat of a matroid and discuss its most basic properties; we also define the T-parts of a T-flat. In Section 3 we consider a representation ϕ of a matroid $\mathbf{M}$ on a set S, and for each subset A of S we define its *multiplicity space*. We also introduce the notions of T-space, multiplication maps, and diagonal maps. In Section 4 we construct the maps ϕ_n^{IJ} that will be the building blocks for the differentials of the complexes $T_\bullet(\phi)$ and $T_\bullet(\phi)^+$. Finally, in Section 5 we give the definitions of the complex $T_\bullet(\phi)$ and of its augmentation $T_\bullet(\phi)^+$.

Sections 6 and 7 constitute the second part of the paper. They are meant to serve as a reference to a reader who is not interested in the technical details of the proofs, but would like a good overview of the essential features of our constructions. In Section 6 we state all the main properties of the complexes $T_\bullet(\phi)$ and $T_\bullet(\phi)^+$. In Section 7 we apply these results to construct from a finite free multigraded presentation $\Phi\colon\ E \longrightarrow G$ of a Noetherian multigraded module L and a chosen multihomogeneous basis S of E a finite free multigraded complex $T_\bullet(\Phi, S)$ and to prove in our second main result that this complex is a free resolution of L.

In the next part of the article we work towards the proofs of all results stated in Section 6. In Section 8 we study the behavior of T-flats under restriction and contraction. Section 9 is devoted to the structure of the T-parts of a T-flat, while Section 10 explores the relationship between connectedness properties of T-flats and the dimension of their multiplicity spaces. Section 11 provides key results on the behavior of multiplicity spaces under restriction and contraction.

Starting with Section 12 we plunge into the most technical part of the paper and we prove that $T_\bullet(\phi)$ and $T_\bullet(\phi)^+$ are indeed complexes. The hard work continues in Sections 13 and 14, where we relate the T-complex of ϕ with the T-complex of a contraction of ϕ. This provides all the facts that are needed in Section 15 to complete the proof of our first main result, namely that the T-complex of ϕ and its augmentation are resolutions of $\operatorname{Ker}(\phi)$ and of $\operatorname{Coker}(\phi)$, respectively.

I would like to thank Hara Charalambous, Bernd Sturmfels, Jerzy Weyman, and Thomas Zaslavski for very useful conversations on questions related to the material in this paper. Their comments contributed to my better understanding of the structures involved, and helped greatly improve the presentation in this article.

We conclude this section with some remarks on notation. Throughout this paper $\Bbbk$ is a field, vector spaces are over $\Bbbk$, and unadorned tensor operations are over $\Bbbk$. For a finite dimensional vector space X we denote by $\mathring{\bigwedge} X$ its top non-zero exterior power. We will often use that an exact sequence $0 \longrightarrow X \xrightarrow{\subset} Y \longrightarrow Z \longrightarrow 0$ of finite dimensional vector spaces induces a canonical isomorphism $\mathring{\bigwedge} X \otimes \mathring{\bigwedge} Z \cong \mathring{\bigwedge} Y$ given by the formula $x_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge x_p \otimes \bar{z}_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \bar{z}_q \longmapsto x_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge x_p \wedge z_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge z_q$ where $p = \dim X$, $q = \dim Z$, and each z_i is an element of Y mapping onto $\bar{z}_i$. Finally, if $C_\bullet = (C_i, \psi_i)$ is a chain complex, its *shift* $C[k]_\bullet$ is the complex $(C[k]_i, \psi[k]_i)$ with $C[k]_i = C_{i+k}$ and $\psi[k]_i = (-1)^k \psi_{i+k}$.

1. MATROIDS

For the convenience of the reader and to establish our notation we recall here some notions and facts from matroid theory that will be needed. For further details and proofs the reader is refered to an introductory textbook on matroids such as [19] or [11]. We also note that for completeness (and in many cases due to lack of appropriate references) throughout the paper we provide a proof for every result on matroids that we use but have not mentioned in this section.

1.1. **Basics.** A *matroid* $\mathbf{M}$ on a finite set S is given by a nonempty collection $\mathbf{I}$ of subsets of S that satisfies the following two properties:

(1) If $X \subset Y$ and $Y \in \mathbf{I}$ then $X \in \mathbf{I}$;

(2) If $X, Y \in \mathbf{I}$, and $|Y| = |X|+1$ then there is $y \in Y \smallsetminus X$ such that $X \cup \{y\} \in \mathbf{I}$.

The matroid $\mathbf{M}$ is called the *empty* matroid if $S = \varnothing$ and $\mathbf{I} = \{\varnothing\}$. The sets in $\mathbf{I}$ are refered to as the *independent* sets of the matroid $\mathbf{M}$. A *base* of $\mathbf{M}$ is a maximal independent set. The matroid $\mathbf{M}$ is completely determined by specifying the collection $\mathbf{B}$ of its bases. A set is *dependent* if it is not independent. A *circuit* of $\mathbf{M}$ is a minimal dependent subset of S. Again, $\mathbf{M}$ is completely determined by specifying the collection of its circuits. The *rank* in $\mathbf{M}$ of a subset A of S is the number $r_A^{\mathbf{M}} = \max\{|I| \mid I \subseteq A, I \in \mathbf{I}\}$. It is clear that

$$r_A^{\mathbf{M}} \leq |A|,$$

with equality precisely when A is independent. When there can be no confusion, we will omit the superscript $\mathbf{M}$. For any $A, B \subseteq S$ we have

$$r_A + r_B \geq r_{A\cup B} + r_{A\cap B}$$

and clearly $r_A \leq r_B$ when $A \subseteq B$. We define the *level* of $A \subseteq S$ to be the integer

$$\ell_A = \ell_A^{\mathbf{M}} = |A| - r_A^{\mathbf{M}} - 1.$$

In particular, a set A is dependent if and only if $\ell_A \geq 0$. The *closure* in $\mathbf{M}$ of a subset $A \subseteq S$ is the (unique) maximal subset $A^{\mathsf{C}_\mathbf{M}}$ of S that contains A and has the same rank as A. When there can be no confusion we will simply write A^{C}. The set A is *closed* or a *flat* in $\mathbf{M}$ if the closure of A is A. The intersection of flats is a flat. A maximal proper flat of $\mathbf{M}$ is called a *hyperplane*. Every proper flat of $\mathbf{M}$ is an intersection of hyperplanes of $\mathbf{M}$. A flat B is a *cover* for a flat A if $A \subsetneq B$ and there are no other flats between A and B. It is clear this happens if and only if $r_B = r_A + 1$. Furthermore, if B and C are distinct covers for A then their intersection is a flat containing A hence equals A; thus the sets $B \smallsetminus A$ and $C \smallsetminus A$ are disjoint. Also, since every element $x \in S \smallsetminus A$ belongs to a cover of A, the union of the covers of A equals S. Therefore, if $A_1, \ldots, A_k$ are all the distinct covers of A, we obtain a disjoint union

$$S \smallsetminus A = (A_1 \smallsetminus A) \sqcup \cdots \sqcup (A_k \smallsetminus A). \tag{1.1}$$

1.2. **Minors, duality, connected components.** Let Y be a subset of S. The *restriction* of $\mathbf{M}$ to Y is the matroid $\mathbf{M}|Y$ on the set Y with collection of independent sets $\mathbf{I}|Y = \{I \mid I \subseteq Y, I \in \mathbf{I}\}$. It follows that for $A \subseteq Y$ one has

$$r_A^{\mathbf{M}|Y} = r_A^{\mathbf{M}}.$$

A subset $A \subseteq Y$ is a flat of $\mathbf{M}|Y$ if and only if $A = A^{\mathsf{C}_\mathbf{M}} \cap Y$. The *contraction* of $\mathbf{M}$ to Y is the matroid $\mathbf{M}.Y$ on Y with collection of independent sets $\mathbf{I}.Y$ defined as follows. A subset $I \subseteq Y$ is independent in $\mathbf{M}.Y$ if $I \cup J \in \mathbf{I}$ for every independent subset $J \subseteq S \setminus Y$. For a subset $A \subseteq Y$ we have

$$r_A^{\mathbf{M}.Y} = r^{\mathbf{M}}_{A \cup (S \setminus Y)} - r^{\mathbf{M}}_{S \setminus Y}.$$

A subset $A \subseteq Y$ is a flat of $\mathbf{M}.Y$ precisely when $A \cup (S \setminus Y)$ is a flat of $\mathbf{M}$. A *minor* of $\mathbf{M}$ is a matroid obtained from $\mathbf{M}$ by a sequence of restrictions and contractions.

The *dual* matroid of $\mathbf{M}$ is the matroid $\mathbf{M}^*$ on S with collection of bases given by $\mathbf{B}^* = \{B \mid S \setminus B \in \mathbf{B}\}$. We have

$$r_A^{\mathbf{M}^*} \quad = \quad |A| - r_S^{\mathbf{M}} + r^{\mathbf{M}}_{S \setminus A} \quad = \quad r_S^{\mathbf{M}^*} - \ell^{\mathbf{M}}_{S \setminus A} - 1. \tag{1.2}$$

We also have $\mathbf{M}^*|T = (\mathbf{M}.T)^*$ and $\mathbf{M}^*.T = (\mathbf{M}|T)^*$. It is straightforward from the rank formula for $\mathbf{M}^*$ that a set C is a circuit of $\mathbf{M}$ if and only if $S \setminus C$ is a hyperplane of $\mathbf{M}^*$.

Let $\mathbf{M}_1$ be a matroid on a set S_1, and let $\mathbf{M}_2$ be a matroid on a set S_2. Then $\mathbf{M}_1 + \mathbf{M}_2$ is the matroid on the set $S_1 \sqcup S_2$ where a subset $A \subseteq S_1 \sqcup S_2$ is independent in $\mathbf{M}_1 + \mathbf{M}_2$ if and only if the sets $A \cap S_1$ and $A \cap S_2$ are independent in $\mathbf{M}_1$ and $\mathbf{M}_2$, respectively. Thus if $\mathbf{M}$ is a matroid on S, and $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{M}_1 + \mathbf{M}_2$ then $S = S_1 \sqcup S_2$, and $\mathbf{M}_1 = \mathbf{M}|S_1$, and $\mathbf{M}_2 = \mathbf{M}|S_2$. It is immediate in this case that a subset $C \subseteq S$ is a circuit of $\mathbf{M}$ if and only if it is a circuit of either $\mathbf{M}_1$ or $\mathbf{M}_2$, and, furthermore, for a subset $A \subseteq S$ one has

$$r_A^{\mathbf{M}} = r^{\mathbf{M}_1}_{A \cap S_1} + r^{\mathbf{M}_2}_{A \cap S_2}.$$

A matroid $\mathbf{M}$ is called *connected* if it is not a sum of two nonempty matroids. A subset $Y \subseteq S$ is called *connected in* $\mathbf{M}$ if the matroid $\mathbf{M}|Y$ is connected. In particular S is connected in $\mathbf{M}$ precisely when $\mathbf{M}$ is connected. It is also straightforward from the definitions that a circuit is connected. The maximal connected subsets of Y are called the *connected components of* Y *in* $\mathbf{M}$. The operation sum of matroids is associative and commutative. If $Y_1, \dots, Y_k$ are subsets of Y such that $\mathbf{M}|Y = \mathbf{M}|Y_1 + \cdots + \mathbf{M}|Y_k$, then we write $Y = Y_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus Y_k$. It is clear in that case we also have for any subset $A \subseteq Y$ that

$$r_A = r_{A \cap Y_1} + \cdots + r_{A \cap Y_k}. \tag{1.3}$$

A convenient criterion which we will use often in the sequel without explicit reference is that $Y = Y_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus Y_k$ if and only if $Y = Y_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup Y_k$ and $r_Y = r_{Y_1} + \cdots + r_{Y_k}$. See Proposition 16.10 for the proof.

1.3. **Representations.** Let $\mathbf{M}$ be a matroid on S. Let W be a $\Bbbk$-vector space, and let $\phi\colon\ S \longrightarrow W$ be a function of sets. We will abuse notation and write ϕ also for the canonically induced homomorphism of vector spaces

$$\phi\colon\ U_S \longrightarrow W,$$

where $U = U_S$ is the $\Bbbk$-vector space with basis the set of symbols $\{e_a \mid a \in S\}$. We write $V = V(\phi) = \operatorname{Im}\phi$ for the corresponding vector subspace of W. For a subset I of S we denote by U_I the span in U of the set $\{e_i \mid i \in I\}$, and by $V_I = V_I(\phi)$ the span in W (hence in V) of the set $\{\phi(i) \mid i \in I\}$; thus V_I is simply the image under ϕ of U_I. Given $a \in I$ we always denote by e_a^* the element of the dual space U_I^* such that $e_a^*(e_a) = 1$ and $e_a^*(e_j) = 0$ for $j \in I \setminus \{a\}$. We will often write U_a, V_a, and $S \setminus a$ instead of $U_{\{a\}}$, $V_{\{a\}}$, and $S \setminus \{a\}$, respectively.

The map ϕ is called a *representation* of the matroid $\mathbf{M}$ (over the field $\Bbbk$) if a subset $A \subseteq S$ is independent in $\mathbf{M}$ precisely when $|A| = \dim_{\Bbbk} V_A$. If ϕ is a representation of $\mathbf{M}$ then clearly $r_I = \dim_{\Bbbk} V_I$.

Let ϕ be a representation of $\mathbf{M}$. For a subset $Y \subseteq S$ let $\phi|Y$ be the restriction of ϕ to the subspace U_Y. Then

$$\phi|Y\colon\ U_Y \longrightarrow W$$

is a representation of the matroid $\mathbf{M}|Y$, and we obviously have for any subset A of Y that $V_A(\phi) = V_A(\phi|Y)$; in particular $V_Y(\phi) = V(\phi|Y)$. Note that if $Y = Y_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup Y_k$ then

$$\phi|Y = \phi|Y_1 + \cdots + \phi|Y_k;$$

if in addition $Y = Y_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus Y_k$ then the formula (1.3) yields for any subset $A \subseteq Y$ the direct sum decomposition of vector spaces

$$V_A = V_{A\cap Y_1} \oplus \cdots \oplus V_{A \cap Y_k}.$$

Also, let $\phi.Y = \pi_Y^{\phi} \circ (\phi|Y)$, where

$$\pi_Y^{\phi}\colon\ W \longrightarrow \overline{W} = W/V_{S\smallsetminus Y}(\phi)$$

is the canonical projection (when ϕ and/or Y are clear from the context, we will write π_Y or simply π instead of π_Y^{ϕ}). Then

$$\phi.Y\colon\ U_Y \longrightarrow \overline{W}$$

is a representation of the matroid $\mathbf{M}.Y$.

1.4. **Group actions.** Let $\mathbf{M}$ be a matroid on a set S. We say that a group H acting on the set S also *acts on the matroid* $\mathbf{M}$ if the collection of independent sets $\mathbf{I}$ is invariant under the action of H on S. It is clear in this case that if $h \in H$ and A is a circuit (respectively, base, flat, dependent set) of $\mathbf{M}$ then so is $h(A)$. Since a base of the dual matroid $\mathbf{M}^*$ is the complement of a base of $\mathbf{M}$, it follows that H acts on $\mathbf{M}^*$ as well.

Let H be a group acting on $\mathbf{M}$, and let $\phi\colon\ U_S \longrightarrow W$ be a representation of $\mathbf{M}$ over a field $\Bbbk$. If in addition H also acts by linear transformations on the vector spaces U_S and W so that for every $h \in H$ and every $a \in S$ one has

$$h(e_a) = \chi(h,a)e_{h(a)}$$

for some (necessarily nonzero) scalar $\chi(h,a) \in \Bbbk$, and so that the map ϕ is H-equivariant, then we say that ϕ is an *H-equivariant representation of the matroid* $\mathbf{M}$. In that case for every $h \in H$ and every $A \subseteq S$ we have canonical isomorphisms $h\colon\ U_A \longrightarrow U_{h(A)}$ and $h\colon\ V_A \longrightarrow V_{h(A)}$, as well as $h_* = (h^{-1})^*\colon\ V_A^* \longrightarrow V_D^*$.

Example 1.4. Let $\mathbf{M}$ be the matroid on S with $\mathbf{I}$ consisting of all subsets of S of size less than or equal to r. $\mathbf{M}$ is called the *uniform matroid of rank r on S*. It is clear that a subset $A \subseteq S$ is a base of $\mathbf{M}$ precisely when $|A| = r$, and is a circuit precisely when $|A| = r+1$. Also, the formulas

$$r_A = \min\{r, |A|\} \quad \text{and} \quad \ell_A = \max\{-1, |A| - r - 1\}.$$

are straightforward.

Example 1.5. Let $S = \{1,2,3,4\}$, let $W = \mathbb{Q}^2$, and let γ_1 and γ_2 be the standard basis vectors of W. Define $\phi\colon\ S \longrightarrow W$ by letting $\phi(i)$ be the ith column of

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 2 & 3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Thus the corresponding map $\phi\colon\ U_S \longrightarrow W$ is given by M. Let $\mathbf{M}$ be the matroid represented by ϕ. Then the circuits of $\mathbf{M}$ are $\{1,2\}$, $\{1,3,4\}$, and $\{2,3,4\}$.

2. T-FLATS

For the rest of the paper $\mathbf{M}$ denotes a matroid on a finite set S, and all sets considered are subsets of S.

The main goal of this section is to recall (under a slightly different name) the somewhat neglected in the literature notion of a *T-flat* of $\mathbf{M}$. Its importance for us lies in the fact that the collection of T-flats provides the most convenient canonical indexing set for the components of the complex $T_\bullet(\Phi, S)$ from Section 7, which generalizes to the setting of multigraded modules the Taylor resolution of a monomial ideal. The study of the collection of T-flats of a matroid goes back to the papers of Tutte [17] and [18] who refers to T-flats of level $n \geq 0$ as "flats of $\mathbf{M}$" or as "n-cells of $\mathbf{M}$". From our point of view the flats terminology is more appropriate. Unfortunately, in modern language the term "flat of $\mathbf{M}$" has taken on a different and well established meaning. Thus we decided on "T-flat" as a smallest deviation from "flat" with the "T" intended as a reference to both Tutte, and Taylor.

Definition 2.1. (a) A set A is called a *T-flat* of $\mathbf{M}$ if and only if $S \smallsetminus A$ is a proper flat of the dual matroid $\mathbf{M}^*$.

(b) When $n \geq 0$ we write $\mathcal{T}_n = \mathcal{T}_n(\mathbf{M})$ for the collection of T-flats of level n in $\mathbf{M}$. We also write $\mathcal{T}_{-1} = \mathcal{T}_{-1}(\mathbf{M})$ for the collection of 1-element subsets of S.

The following observations are essentially due to Tutte [17].

Remarks 2.2. ([17]). Let A be a T-flat in $\mathbf{M}$ of level n.

(a) Then $S \smallsetminus A$ is a proper flat in $\mathbf{M}^*$ of rank $r^{\mathbf{M}^*}_{S\smallsetminus A} = r^{\mathbf{M}^*}_S - n - 1$. In particular $n \geq 0$, and when $n = 0$ the flat $S \smallsetminus A$ is a hyperplane in $\mathbf{M}^*$ hence A is a circuit of $\mathbf{M}$. Thus the T-flats in $\mathbf{M}$ of smallest level all have level 0 and are nothing but the circuits of $\mathbf{M}$.

(b) Let $n \geq 1$, and let $B \subsetneq A$ be a T-flat. Then $S \smallsetminus A \subsetneq S \smallsetminus B$, hence a straightforward application of (1.2) yields $\ell^{\mathbf{M}}_B \leq n-1$ with equality precisely when $S \smallsetminus B$ is a cover for $S \smallsetminus A$ in $\mathbf{M}^*$, that is, when B is a maximal T-flat properly contained in A. Therefore the T-flats of $\mathbf{M}$ that are maximal with respect to the property of being properly contained in A are precisely the T-flats of level $n-1$ contained in A.

(c) It is immediate from parts (a) and (b) that a T-flat is minimal if and only if it is a circuit, and that every chain of maximal length of T-flats contained inside A has the form

$$I^{(0)} \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq I^{(n)} = A$$

where for each i the set $I^{(i)}$ is a T-flat of level i.

(d) Let $n \geq 1$ and let $A_1, \dots, A_k$ be all the T-flats of level $n-1$ contained in A. Applying part (b) and (1.1) yields a natural partition of A as a disjoint union

$$A = I_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup I_k, \tag{2.3}$$

where $I_i = A \smallsetminus A_i$ for each i.

(e) Since $S \smallsetminus A$ is a proper flat in $\mathbf{M}^*$ precisely when it is an intersection of hyperplanes of $\mathbf{M}^*$, it is immediate from part (a) that A is a T-flat precisely when it is a union of circuits of $\mathbf{M}$. In particular, unions of T-flats are T-flats.

(f) Let $A = \{a\}$ be a singleton, i.e. $A \in \mathcal{T}_{-1}(\mathbf{M})$. Note that $\ell_A \leq 0$ with equality if and only if A is dependent, in which case A is a circuit. (An element $a \in S$ such that $\{a\}$ is a dependent is called a *loop* of $\mathbf{M}$.) Thus A is an element of both $\mathcal{T}_0(\mathbf{M})$ and $\mathcal{T}_{-1}(\mathbf{M})$ if and only if $A = \{a\}$ for some loop $a \in S$. It is clear that this is the only case when two sets $\mathcal{T}_i(\mathbf{M})$ and $\mathcal{T}_j(\mathbf{M})$ with $-1 \leq i < j$ have a nontrivial intersection.

Definition 2.4. Let A be a T-flat in $\mathbf{M}$ of level n, and let $A_1, \dots, A_k$ be all elements of $\mathcal{T}_{n-1}(\mathbf{M})$ contained in A.

(a) We refer to the sets $I_i = A \smallsetminus A_i$ as the *T-parts* of the T-flat A.

(b) When $n \geq 1$ the natural partition (2.3) is called the *T-partition* of A.

Remark 2.5. Let H be a group acting on $\mathbf{M}$, and let $h \in H$. It is clear that if I is an element of $\mathcal{T}_n(\mathbf{M})$ (respectively, a T-part of a T-flat A), then $h(I)$ is an element of $\mathcal{T}_n(\mathbf{M})$ (repsectively, a T-part of the T-flat $h(A)$). In particular, h sends the T-partition of a T-flat A into the T-partition of the T-flat $h(A)$.

The following proposition provides an alternative description of the T-flats of the matroid $\mathbf{M}$.

Proposition 2.6. *Let A be a set of level $n \geq 1$.*

Then A is a T-flat if and only if it has a decomposition $A = I_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup I_k$ such that $A_j = A \smallsetminus I_j$ is a T-flat of level $n-1$ for each j. In that case $A_1, \dots, A_k$ are all the T-flats of $\mathbf{M}$ of level $n-1$ that are contained in A.

Proof. The "only if" part of the proposition is immediate from Remark 2.2(b). To show the "if" part, assume $A = I_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup I_k$ with $A_j = A \smallsetminus I_j$ a T-flat of level $n-1$ for each j. Since $n \geq 1$, we must have $k \geq 2$. Then $A = A_1 \cup A_2$, and since each A_j is a T-flat the desired conclusion follows by Remark 2.2(c). □

Example 2.7. Let $\mathbf{M}$ be the uniform matroid of rank r on the set S as in Example 1.4. It is clear that a subset $A \subseteq S$ is a T-flat of level $n \geq 0$ in $\mathbf{M}$ if and only if $|A| = n + r + 1$. Therefore when $n \geq 1$ and A is a T-flat of level n the T-parts of A are all the 1-element subsets of A.

Example 2.8. Let $\mathbf{M}$ be the matroid from Example 1.5. The T-flats of $\mathbf{M}$ are:

$$\begin{aligned} &\text{level } 0: \quad \{1,2\}, \{1,3,4\}, \{2,3,4\} \\ &\text{level } 1: \quad \{1,2,3,4\}. \end{aligned}$$

In particular, $\{1,2,3,4\} = \{3,4\} \sqcup \{2\} \sqcup \{1\}$ is the T-partition of the only T-flat of positive level in $\mathbf{M}$.

3. Multiplicity spaces, T-spaces, diagonal maps

In this section $\phi \colon U_S \longrightarrow W$ is a representation over a field $\Bbbk$ of a matroid $\mathbf{M}$ on a finite set S.

Our main goal is to introduce in Definition 3.3 the *multiplicity space* $S_A(\phi)$ of a set A. This is a new object, which appears to encode subtle combinatorial properties of the matroid $\mathbf{M}|A$. A detailed investigation of the properties of these multiplicity spaces will be carried out in later sections. For us their significance lies in the fact that the multiplicity space of a set A of level $n \geq 0$ measures the contribution of A to the component of homological degree n in the complex $T_\bullet(\phi)$. We also introduce in Definition 3.6 the *diagonal maps* between mutiplicity spaces. These maps are the essential ingredients out of which the differentials of the complex $T_\bullet(\phi)$ are built.

We begin by introducing the following objects associated with a T-flat I.

Definition 3.1. (a) Let I be a T-flat of level n. We write

$$C_{\mathbf{M}}(I) = \{I^{(0)} \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq I^{(n)} = I \mid \text{ where } I^{(i)} \in \mathcal{T}_i \text{ for each } i \geq 0\}$$

for the collection of all maximal chains of T-flats contained in the T-flat I. When there can be no confusion we will write simply $C(I)$.

(b) Let $\mathbb{I}$ be a chain $I^{(0)} \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq I^{(n)}$ in $C(I)$. When $n = 0$ then $\mathbb{I}$ is the only element of $C(I)$, and we set $V(\mathbb{I}) = S_0 W = \Bbbk$. When $n \geq 1$ we define the vector subspace $V(\mathbb{I}) \subseteq S_n W$ of the nth symmetric power of W as

$$V(\mathbb{I}) \quad = \quad \big(V_{I^{(1)} \smallsetminus I^{(0)}} \cap V_{I^{(0)}}\big) \ \cdot \ \ldots \ \cdot \ \big(V_{I^{(n)} \smallsetminus I^{(n-1)}} \cap V_{I^{(n-1)}}\big),$$

where the product of these vector spaces is taken in the symmetric algebra of W.

Remark 3.2. Since the levels of $I^{(i)}$ and $I^{(i-1)}$ differ by exactly one, a straightforward computation shows that each space $V_{I^{(i)} \smallsetminus I^{(i-1)}} \cap V_{I^{(i-1)}}$ is either 0 or is 1-dimensional. Therefore the space $V(\mathbb{I})$ is either 0 or is 1-dimensional. This observation is refined further in Remark 9.2

We are now ready to give the definition of multiplicity space.

Definition 3.3. Let $I \subseteq S$ be a set of level n.

(a) If I is not a T-flat then we set $S_I(\phi) = 0$. If I is a T-flat, then we set

$$S_I(\phi) = \sum_{\mathbb{I} \in C(I)} V(\mathbb{I}).$$

We call the space $S_I(\phi)$ the *multiplicity space* of the dependent set I. When there can be no confusion, we simply write S_I.

(b) When $n \geq 0$ we set

$$T_I(\phi) = S_I(\phi)^* \otimes \mathring{\bigwedge} U_I \otimes \mathring{\bigwedge} V_I(\phi)^*$$

and call the space $T_I(\phi)$ the *T-space* of I. When there can be no confusion, we simply write T_I.

(c) Note that when $A = \{a\}$ is an element of $\mathcal{T}_0(\mathbf{M})$ then we have by Remark 3.4(a) that $S_A^* = \Bbbk^* = \Bbbk$, also $\mathring{\bigwedge} U_A = U_a$, and $V_A = 0$ hence $\mathring{\bigwedge} V_A^* = \Bbbk$; thus for the T-space T_A we have $T_A = \Bbbk \otimes U_a \otimes \Bbbk = U_a$. We extend this identification to all 1-element subsets of S by setting

$$T_A(\phi) = T_A = U_a$$

for every element $A = \{a\} \in \mathcal{T}_{-1}(\mathbf{M})$.

Remarks 3.4. Let I be a T-flat of level n.

(a) When $n = 0$ there is exactly one chain $\mathbb{I}$ in $C(I)$, thus $S_I = V(\mathbb{I}) = S_0 W = \Bbbk$.

(b) We should note that the T-space of I is essentially the dual of S_I tensored with a copy of the field $\Bbbk$; in particular the dimensions of T_I and S_I are the same. The special form of T_I is what turns out to be necessary in order to define in a canonical way the differentials in our complex $T_\bullet(\phi)$.

(c) While the multiplicity space $S_I(\phi)$ clearly depends on the representation ϕ, we will show that its dimension is an invariant of the matroid $\mathbf{M}|I$, and is independent of the representation map ϕ.

(d) The collection of spaces $V(\mathbb{I})$ determine in a natural way a representation of a certain matroid on the set of chains $C_{\mathbf{M}}(I)$. It is a very interesting open question whether this matroid is in fact independent of the representation map ϕ.

Remarks 3.5. Let ϕ be an H-equivariant representation of $\mathbf{M}$, and let $h \in H$.

(a) If $\mathbb{I}$ is a chain $I^{(0)} \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq I^{(n)}$ in $C(I)$ then we obtain that $h(\mathbb{I})$ is a chain

$$h(I^{(0)}) \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq h(I^{(n)})$$

in the set $C\big(h(I)\big)$. In particular, h induces a bijection of the sets $C(I)$ and $C\big(h(I)\big)$.

(b) The action of h on W induces canonically an automorphism of the symmmetric algebra of W. Furtermore, if $\mathbb{I}$ is a chain $I^{(0)} \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq I^{(n)}$ in $C(I)$, then h induces for each $i \geq 1$ an isomorphism

$$h\colon\ V_{I^{(i-1)}} \cap V_{I^{(i)} \smallsetminus I^{(i-1)}} \quad\longrightarrow\quad V_{h(I^{(i-1)})} \cap V_{h(I^{(i)}) \smallsetminus h(I^{(i-1)})}.$$

Thus h induces an isomorphism of the spaces $V(\mathbb{I})$ and $V\big(h(\mathbb{I})\big)$, hence also an isomorphism

$$h\colon\ S_I(\phi) \longrightarrow S_{h(I)}(\phi).$$

of multiplicity spaces.

(c) Let I be a T-flat of level n. We have an isomorphism $h\colon\ T_I(\phi) \longrightarrow T_{h(I)}(\phi)$ given by

$$T_I = S_I^* \otimes \mathring{\wedge}\, U_I \otimes \mathring{\wedge}\, V_I^* \xrightarrow{h_* \otimes \wedge h \otimes \wedge h_*} S_{h(I)}^* \otimes \mathring{\wedge}\, U_{h(I)} \otimes \mathring{\wedge}\, V_{h(I)}^* = T_{h(I)}$$

where we write h_* for $(h^{-1})^*$.

We conclude this section with the definition of the *multiplication maps* and the *diagonal maps*. These maps are the essential ingredient of the differentials in the complex $T_\bullet(\phi)$.

Definition 3.6. Let I be a T-flat of level $n \geq 1$ and let $J \subsetneq I$ be a T-flat of level $n-1$. Multiplication in the symmetric algebra of W induces an injective map

$$\nu\colon\ (V_J \cap V_{I \smallsetminus J}) \otimes S_J \longrightarrow S_I.$$

which we call the *multiplication map.* Summing over all T-flats of level $n-1$ in I, we obtain a surjective map with the same name

$$\bigoplus_{\substack{J \in \mathcal{T}_{n-1} \\ J \subset I}} (V_J \cap V_{I \smallsetminus J}) \otimes S_J \quad\xrightarrow{\nu}\quad S_I \tag{3.7}$$

Taking duals we obtain a surjective map

$$\Delta\colon\ S_I^* \longrightarrow (V_J \cap V_{I \smallsetminus J})^* \otimes S_J^*$$

which we refer to as the *diagonal map*, and an injective map with the same name

$$S_I^* \quad\xrightarrow{\Delta}\quad \bigoplus_{\substack{J \in \mathcal{T}_{n-1} \\ J \subset I}} (V_J \cap V_{I \smallsetminus J})^* \otimes S_J^*. \tag{3.8}$$

Remark 3.9. Let ϕ be H-equivariant representation of $\mathbf{M}$, and let $h \in H$. Let I be a T-flat of level $n \geq 1$, and let J be a T-flat of level $n-1$ contained inside I. It is straightforward to verify that the map $h\colon\ S_I \longrightarrow S_{h(I)}$ from Remark 3.5(c) commutes with the multiplication maps ν, thus setting $h_* = (h^{-1})^*$ yields a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
S_I^* \arrow[r, "\Delta"] \arrow[d, "h_*"'] & (V_J \cap V_{I \smallsetminus J})^* \otimes S_J^* \arrow[d, "h_* \otimes h_*"] \\
S_{h(I)}^* \arrow[r, "\Delta"] & \big(V_{h(J)} \cap V_{h(I) \smallsetminus h(J)}\big)^* \otimes S_{h(J)}^*
\end{tikzcd}$$

with vertical maps that are isomorphism.

Example 3.10. Let $\phi\colon\ U_S \longrightarrow W$ be a representation of the uniform matroid $\mathbf{M}$ of rank r on S, and let $V = \operatorname{Im}\phi$. Then for each T-flat I of level n in $\mathbf{M}$ we clearly have $V_I = V$. Furthermore,

$$S_I(\phi) = S_n V.$$

Indeed, this is trivially true when $n = 0$. When $n \geq 1$ by Example 2.7 the T-flats of level $n-1$ in I are all sets of the form $J = I \smallsetminus \{a\}$ for some $a \in I$, therefore we have $\sum_{I \supset J \in \mathcal{T}_{n-1}} V_J \cap V_{I \smallsetminus J} = \sum_{a \in I} V_{I \smallsetminus a} \cap V_a = \sum_{a \in I} V_a = V_I = V$. The desired equality now follows by induction on n in view of the surjectivity of (3.7).

Example 3.11. Let $\phi\colon\ U_S \longrightarrow W$ be the representation of the matroid $\mathbf{M}$ from Examples 1.5 and 2.8. Let $\{\gamma_1^*, \gamma_2^*\}$ be the basis of W^* dual to the standard basis of W. Then we have

$$S_{\{1,2,3,4\}} = V_{\{1,2\}} \cap V_{\{3,4\}} + V_{\{1,3,4\}} \cap V_{\{2\}} + V_{\{2,3,4\}} \cap V_{\{1\}} = V_{\{1,2\}},$$

therefore for the T-spaces of the T-flats of $\mathbf{M}$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{\{1,2\}} &= \mathbb{Q} \otimes \wedge^2 U_{\{1,2\}} \otimes V_{\{1,2\}}^* \\
&= \mathbb{Q} \cdot \big\langle 1 \otimes e_{12} \otimes (\gamma_1 + \gamma_2)^* \big\rangle \\[1ex]
T_{\{1,3,4\}} &= \mathbb{Q} \otimes \wedge^3 U_{\{1,3,4\}} \otimes \wedge^2 W^* \\
&= \mathbb{Q} \cdot \big\langle 1 \otimes e_{134} \otimes \gamma_{12}^* \big\rangle \\[1ex]
T_{\{2,3,4\}} &= \mathbb{Q} \otimes \wedge^3 U_{\{2,3,4\}} \otimes \wedge^2 W^* \\
&= \mathbb{Q} \cdot \big\langle 1 \otimes e_{234} \otimes \gamma_{12}^* \big\rangle \\[1ex]
T_{\{1,2,3,4\}} &= S_{\{1,2,3,4\}}^* \otimes \wedge^4 U_{\{1,2,3,4\}} \otimes \wedge^2 W^* \\
&= \mathbb{Q} \cdot \big\langle (\gamma_1 + \gamma_2)^* \otimes e_{1234} \otimes \gamma_{12}^* \big\rangle
\end{aligned}$$

where we use the shorthand $z_{a_1 \ldots a_k}$ for $z_{a_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge z_{a_k}$. The remaining nonzero T-spaces of $\mathbf{M}$ are, for trivial reasons, $T_{\{i\}} = U_{\{i\}} = \mathbb{Q} \cdot e_i$ for $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$.

4. THE HOMOMORPHISMS ϕ_n^{IJ}

As in the previous section, we fix a representation $\phi :\ U_S \longrightarrow W$ over $\Bbbk$ of a matroid $\mathbf{M}$ on a finite set S. Our goal is to introduce in Definition 4.2 for every T-flat I of level n and for every element $J \in \mathcal{T}_{n-1}(\mathbf{M})$ contained inside I a homomorphism between T-spaces

$$\phi_n^{IJ} \colon\ T_I(\phi) \longrightarrow T_J(\phi).$$

The maps ϕ_n^{IJ} will be used in the next section as the building blocks of the differentials of the complex $T_\bullet(\phi)$. First, we establish the following notation.

Definition 4.1. Let $J \subseteq I$ be subsets of S.

(a) We define the space K_{IJ} by the formula

$$K_{IJ} = V_I / V_J.$$

(b) Since $V_I = V_J + V_{I \smallsetminus J}$ we have a natural commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & V_J \cap V_{I \smallsetminus J} \arrow[r, "\subseteq"] \arrow[d, "\subseteq"'] & V_{I \smallsetminus J} \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\subseteq"'] & K_{IJ} \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "="'] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & V_J \arrow[r, "\subseteq"] & V_I \arrow[r] & K_{IJ} \arrow[r] & 0
\end{tikzcd}$$

with exact rows; we use it to identify canonically K_{IJ} and $V_{I \smallsetminus J}/(V_J \cap V_{I \smallsetminus J})$.

(c) As mentioned in the Introduction, we have a naturally induced diagonal isomorphism

$$\boldsymbol{\delta} = \boldsymbol{\delta}_{\mathbf{IJ}} \colon \quad \mathring{\bigwedge} U_I \quad \longrightarrow \quad \mathring{\bigwedge} U_{I \smallsetminus J} \otimes \mathring{\bigwedge} U_J$$

and a canonical isomorphism

$$\mathbf{a} = \mathbf{a}_{\mathbf{IJ}}^{\mathbf{M}} \colon \quad \mathring{\bigwedge} V_I^* \quad \longrightarrow \quad \mathring{\bigwedge} K_{IJ}^* \otimes \mathring{\bigwedge} V_J^*$$

induced by the bottom row of the commutative diagram from Part (b) above.

(d) Let I be a T-flat of level $n \geq 1$, and let J be a T-flat of level $n-1$ inside I. Recall from Remark 3.2 that the space $V_J \cap V_{I \smallsetminus J}$ is either 0 or has dimension 1. In particular, the top row of the commutative diagram from Part (b) induces a canonical homomorphism

$$\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{b}_{\mathbf{IJ}}^{\mathbf{M}} \colon \quad (V_J \cap V_{I \smallsetminus J})^* \otimes \mathring{\bigwedge} K_{IJ}^* \quad \longrightarrow \quad \mathring{\bigwedge} V_{I \smallsetminus J}^*$$

which is zero when $V_J \cap V_{I \smallsetminus J} = 0$, and is an isomorphism otherwise.

We are now ready to state the desired definition.

Definition 4.2. Let I be a T-flat of level $n \geq 0$, and let J be an element of $\mathcal{T}_{n-1}(\mathbf{M})$ contained inside I. We define a homomorphism

$$\phi_n^{IJ} \colon\ T_I(\phi) \longrightarrow T_J(\phi)$$

as follows.

(a) When $n = 0$ the T-flat I is a circuit and $J = \{a\}$, hence $I \smallsetminus a$ is independent with $V_I = V_{I \smallsetminus a}$. Furthermore $S_I(\phi)^* = \Bbbk^* = \Bbbk$ and $T_J(\phi) = U_a$, and we define the homomorphism $\phi_n^{IJ} = \phi_0^{I,a}\colon\ T_I \longrightarrow U_a$ as the composition

$$\begin{tikzcd}
S_I^* \otimes \mathring{\bigwedge} U_I \otimes \mathring{\bigwedge} V_I^* \arrow[d, "1\otimes\boldsymbol{\delta}\otimes 1"] \\
\Bbbk \otimes (U_a \otimes \mathring{\bigwedge} U_{I\smallsetminus a}) \otimes \mathring{\bigwedge} V_{I\smallsetminus a}^* \arrow[d, "\tau"] \\
\mathring{\bigwedge} U_{I\smallsetminus a} \otimes \mathring{\bigwedge} V_{I\smallsetminus a}^* \otimes U_a \arrow[d, "\wedge\phi\otimes 1\otimes 1"] \\
(\mathring{\bigwedge} V_{I\smallsetminus a} \otimes \mathring{\bigwedge} V_{I\smallsetminus a}^*) \otimes U_a \arrow[d, "\mu\otimes 1"] \\
U_a
\end{tikzcd}$$

where $\mu\colon\ X \otimes X^* \longrightarrow \Bbbk$ is the canonical evaluation map, and τ is the isomorphism which simply permutes the components of the tensor product as indicated.

(b) When $n \geq 1$ then J is a T-flat of level $n-1$ and we define the map ϕ_n^{IJ} as the composition

$$T_I(\phi) \xrightarrow{\Delta\otimes\boldsymbol{\delta}\otimes\mathbf{a}} \mathcal{Q}_{IJ}(\phi) \xrightarrow{\ \tau\ } \mathcal{R}_{IJ}(\phi) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{b}\otimes\wedge\phi\otimes 1} \mathcal{S}_{IJ}(\phi) \xrightarrow{\mu\otimes 1} T_J(\phi)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{Q}_{IJ} &= (V_J \cap V_{I\smallsetminus J})^* \otimes S_J^* \otimes \big(\mathring{\bigwedge} U_{I\smallsetminus J} \otimes \mathring{\bigwedge} U_J\big) \otimes \big(\mathring{\bigwedge} K_{IJ}^* \otimes \mathring{\bigwedge} V_J^*\big),\\
\mathcal{R}_{IJ} &= \big[(V_J \cap V_{I\smallsetminus J})^* \otimes \mathring{\bigwedge} K_{IJ}^*\big] \otimes \mathring{\bigwedge} U_{I\smallsetminus J} \otimes \big(S_J^* \otimes \mathring{\bigwedge} U_J \otimes \mathring{\bigwedge} V_J^*\big),\\
\mathcal{S}_{IJ} &= \mathring{\bigwedge} V_{I\smallsetminus J}^* \otimes \mathring{\bigwedge} V_{I\smallsetminus J} \otimes T_J,
\end{aligned}$$

the map $\Delta\colon\ S_I^* \longrightarrow (V_J \cap V_{I\smallsetminus J})^* \otimes S_J^*$ is the diagonal map from Definition 3.6, and the map $\wedge\phi\colon\ \mathring{\bigwedge} U_{I\smallsetminus J} \longrightarrow \mathring{\bigwedge} V_{I\smallsetminus J}$ is zero if $I \smallsetminus J$ is not independent, and is the canonical isomorphism induced by ϕ otherwise.

Remarks 4.3. (a) If $I = \{a\}$ is a T-flat of level $n = 0$, then the only element of $\mathcal{T}_{n-1} = \mathcal{T}_{-1}$ contained inside I is $J = \{a\} = I$. In that case $T_I = U_a = T_J$, and the formula for $\phi_n^{IJ} = \phi_0^{a,a}\colon\ U_a \longrightarrow U_a$ yields simply the identity map of U_a.

(b) We note that when $n \geq 1$ the map ϕ_n^{IJ} is essentially the same as the diagonal map Δ. In fact, all other maps appearing in the definition are isomorphisms except possibly the map $\wedge\phi$ which is zero if $I \smallsetminus J$ is not independent. In that case however we have $V_J \cap V_{I\smallsetminus J} = 0$ by Remark 9.2, hence also both $\Delta = 0$ and $\phi_n^{IJ} = 0$. Therefore we always have $\operatorname{Ker}(\phi_n^{IJ}) = \operatorname{Ker}(\Delta) \otimes \mathring{\bigwedge} U_I \otimes \mathring{\bigwedge} V_I^*$.

Remarks 4.4. Let ϕ be an H-equivariant representation of the matroid $\mathbf{M}$, and consider an element $h \in H$.

(a) It is straightforward to verify from the definitions that for each T-flat I of level $n \geq 1$ and each T-flat J of level $n-1$ contained inside I we have a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
T_I \arrow[r, "\phi_n^{IJ}"] \arrow[d, "h"'] & T_J \arrow[d, "h"] \\
T_{h(I)} \arrow[r, "\phi_n^{h(I),h(J)}"] & T_{h(J)}
\end{tikzcd}$$

where the vertical maps are the isomorphisms from Remark 3.5(c).

(b) Similarly, when I is a circuit and $a \in I$ one verifies from the definitions that

$$\begin{tikzcd}
T_I \arrow[r, "\phi_0^{I,a}"] \arrow[d, "h"'] & U_a \arrow[d, "h"] \\
T_{h(I)} \arrow[r, "\phi_0^{h(I),h(a)}"] & U_{h(a)}
\end{tikzcd}$$

is a commutative diagram.

Example 4.5. Let $\mathbf{M}$ be the matroid represented by the map ϕ from Example 1.5. In Example 3.11 we described all the nonzero T-spaces and gave a basis for each one of them over the field $\mathbb{Q}$. Here we compute the images of these basis elements under each of the maps ϕ_n^{IJ}. Consider, say, the map

$$\phi_1^{\{1,2,3,4\},\{1,2\}}\colon\ T_{\{1,2,3,4\}} \longrightarrow T_{\{1,2\}}.$$

According to Definition 4.2 the image of the basis element of $T_{\{1,2,3,4\}}$ is obtained through the following sequence of transformations:

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)^* \otimes\ \ e_{1234}\ \ \otimes\ \ \gamma_{12}^* \\
&\qquad \overset{\Delta\otimes\boldsymbol{\delta}\otimes\mathbf{a}}{\longmapsto}\ (\gamma_1+\gamma_2)^*\otimes 1\otimes e_{34}\otimes e_{12}\otimes(\gamma_1^*-\gamma_2^*)\otimes\gamma_2^*\big|_{V_{\{1,2\}}} \\
&\qquad \overset{\tau}{\longmapsto}\ (\gamma_1+\gamma_2)^*\otimes(\gamma_1^*-\gamma_2^*)\otimes e_{34}\otimes 1\otimes e_{12}\otimes(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)^* \\
&\qquad \overset{\mathbf{b}\otimes\wedge\phi\otimes 1}{\longmapsto}\ \gamma_2^*\wedge(\gamma_1^*-\gamma_2^*)\otimes(\gamma_1+2\gamma_2)\wedge(\gamma_1+3\gamma_2)\otimes 1\otimes e_{12}\otimes(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)^* \\
&\qquad \overset{=}{\longmapsto}\ -\gamma_{12}^*\otimes\gamma_{12}\otimes 1\otimes e_{12}\otimes(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)^* \\
&\qquad \overset{\mu\otimes 1}{\longmapsto}\ -1\otimes e_{12}\otimes(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)^*.
\end{aligned}$$

Proceeding in a similar fashion one obtains the following list for the maps ϕ_1^{IJ}:

$$\begin{array}{lclcr}
\phi_1^{\{1,2,3,4\},\{1,2\}} & : & (\gamma_1+\gamma_2)^*\otimes e_{1234}\otimes\gamma_{12}^* & \longmapsto & -1\otimes e_{12}\otimes(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)^* \\
\phi_1^{\{1,2,3,4\},\{1,3,4\}} & : & (\gamma_1+\gamma_2)^*\otimes e_{1234}\otimes\gamma_{12}^* & \longmapsto & -1\otimes e_{134}\otimes\gamma_{12}^* \\
\phi_1^{\{1,2,3,4\},\{2,3,4\}} & : & (\gamma_1+\gamma_2)^*\otimes e_{1234}\otimes\gamma_{12}^* & \longmapsto & 1\otimes e_{234}\otimes\gamma_{12}^*.
\end{array}$$

Finally, we give the corresponding list for the maps $\phi_0^{I,a}$:

$$\begin{array}{lclcr}
\phi_0^{\{1,2\},1} & : & 1\otimes e_{12}\otimes(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)^* & \longmapsto & e_1 \\
\phi_0^{\{1,2\},2} & : & 1\otimes e_{12}\otimes(\gamma_1+\gamma_2)^* & \longmapsto & -e_2 \\
\phi_0^{\{1,3,4\},1} & : & 1\otimes e_{134}\otimes\gamma_{12}^* & \longmapsto & e_1 \\
\phi_0^{\{1,3,4\},3} & : & 1\otimes e_{134}\otimes\gamma_{12}^* & \longmapsto & -2e_3 \\
\phi_0^{\{1,3,4\},4} & : & 1\otimes e_{134}\otimes\gamma_{12}^* & \longmapsto & e_4 \\
\phi_0^{\{2,3,4\},2} & : & 1\otimes e_{234}\otimes\gamma_{12}^* & \longmapsto & e_2 \\
\phi_0^{\{2,3,4\},3} & : & 1\otimes e_{234}\otimes\gamma_{12}^* & \longmapsto & -2e_3 \\
\phi_0^{\{2,3,4\},4} & : & 1\otimes e_{234}\otimes\gamma_{12}^* & \longmapsto & e_4.
\end{array}$$

5. THE DEFINITION OF $T_\bullet(\phi)$ AND $T_\bullet(\phi)^+$

As in the previous section, here $\phi\colon\ U_S \longrightarrow W$ is a representation over $\Bbbk$ of a matroid $\mathbf{M}$ on a finite set S. The main goal is to present in Definition 5.5 the description of the chain complex $T_\bullet(\phi)$ and of its augmentation $T_\bullet(\phi)^+$. We begin with the chains in homological degree n.

Definition 5.1. For $n \geq -1$ we define the space $T_n = T_n(\phi)$ by the formula

$$T_n = \bigoplus_{I \in \mathcal{T}_n(\mathbf{M})} T_I(\phi)$$

and note that when $n = -1$ this simply yields $T_{-1} = \bigoplus_{a \in S} U_a = U_S$. Next, we set

$$\lambda = |S| - r_S^{\mathbf{M}} - 1$$

and observe that for trivial reasons $T_n = 0$ when $n \geq \lambda+1$. Finally, we set $T_0^+ = W$, while for $n \geq 1$ we set $T_n^+ = T_{n-2}$.

Next we describe the differentials of our complexes.

Definition 5.2. Let $n \geq 0$. We define the map

$$\phi_n\colon\ T_n \longrightarrow T_{n-1}$$

by specifying that its restriction to the component $T_I(\phi)$ of T_n be given by

$$\phi_n\big|_{T_I} = \sum_{\substack{J \in \mathcal{T}_{n-1}(\mathbf{M}) \\ J \subseteq I}} (-1)^{|J|} \phi_n^{IJ}.$$

When $n = 0$ we will refer to the map ϕ_0 also as the *augmentation* or *splicing homomorphism*. We also define for $n \geq 1$ the map

$$\phi_n^+\colon\ T_n^+ \longrightarrow T_{n-1}^+$$

by setting $\phi_1^+ = \phi$, and by setting $\phi_n^+ = \phi_{n-2}$ for $n \geq 2$.

Remark 5.3. If $n \geq 1$ then by Remark 4.3(b) and the injectivity of (3.8) we have

$$\operatorname{Ker}\bigl(\phi_n\big|_{T_I}\bigr) = \operatorname{Ker}(\Delta) \otimes \overset{\circ}{\bigwedge} U_I \otimes \overset{\circ}{\bigwedge} V_I^* = 0,$$

therfore the map $\phi_n\big|_{T_I}$ is injective.

Remark 5.4. Let ϕ be an H-equivariant representation of the matroid $\mathbf{M}$. Putting Remark 4.4 together with the definition of the maps ϕ_n and ϕ_n^+, it follows that for each $n \geq 0$ we have a canonically induced action of H on the spaces T_n and T_n^+ such that when $n \geq 1$ the maps ϕ_n and ϕ_n^+ are H-equivariant.

We are now ready to achieve the main goal of this section.

Definition 5.5. (a) We write $T_\bullet(\phi)$ for the sequence

$$T_\bullet(\phi) = 0 \longrightarrow T_\lambda \xrightarrow{\phi_\lambda} T_{\lambda-1} \longrightarrow \ldots \longrightarrow T_1 \xrightarrow{\phi_1} T_0 \longrightarrow 0$$

and call it the *T-complex* of the representation ϕ.

(b) We write $T_\bullet(\phi)^+$ for the sequence

$$T_\bullet(\phi)^+ = 0 \to T_{\lambda+2}^+ \xrightarrow{\phi_{\lambda+2}^+} T_{\lambda+1}^+ \to \cdots \to T_2^+ \xrightarrow{\phi_2^+} T_1^+ \xrightarrow{\phi_1^+} T_0^+ \to 0$$

and call it the *augmented T-complex* of the representation ϕ.

Remark 5.6. Since the maps $\phi_2^+ :\ T_2^+ \longrightarrow T_1^+$ and $\phi_1^+ :\ T_1^+ \longrightarrow T_0^+$ are just the maps $\phi_0 \colon\ T_0 \longrightarrow U_S$ and $\phi \colon\ U_S \longrightarrow W$ respectively, the sequence $T_\bullet(\phi)^+$ is nothing but the shifted sequence $T_\bullet(\phi)[-2]$, spliced via the splicing homomorphism $\phi_0 \colon\ T_0 \longrightarrow U$ with the map $\phi \colon\ U \longrightarrow W$.

Example 5.7. Let $\phi \colon\ U_S \longrightarrow W$ be a representation over $\Bbbk$ of the uniform matroid $\mathbf{M}$ of rank r on S. Then using Example 3.10 we obtain for each $n \geq 0$ canonical isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned} T_n(\phi) &= \bigoplus\nolimits_{|I|=n+r+1} T_I(\phi) \\ &= \bigoplus\nolimits_{|I|=n+r+1} (S_n V)^* \otimes \mathring{\wedge}\, U_I \otimes \mathring{\wedge}\, V^* \\ &\cong D_n V^* \otimes \wedge^{n+r+1} U_S \otimes \wedge^r V^*. \end{aligned}$$

We use these to identify $T_n(\phi)$ with the space $D_n V^* \otimes \wedge^{n+r+1} U_S \otimes \wedge^r V^*$. It is immediate from the definitions that under these identifications for each $n \geq 0$ the vector space T_n^+ becomes precisely the vector space of chains B_n of the Buchsbaum-Rim complex $B_\bullet(\phi)$ from [2] (in the form described in [6, Section 3]). Furthermore, the maps ϕ_1^+ and $-\phi_2^+$ transform exactly to the differentials ϕ and ϕ_2 respectively, of the complex $B_\bullet(\phi)$. Finally, when $n \geq 3$ the morphism ϕ_n^+ of $T_\bullet(\phi)^+$ becomes precisely equal to $(-1)^{n-2+r}$ times the differential ϕ_n of $B_\bullet(\phi)$.

In summary, when ϕ represents a uniform matroid the sequence $T_\bullet(\phi)^+$ is canonically isomorphic to the Buchsbaum-Rim complex $B_\bullet(\phi)$, in particular it is a resolution of $\operatorname{Coker}(\phi)$.

Example 5.8. Let $\mathbf{M}$ be the matroid represented by the map ϕ from Example 1.5. Thus the sequence $T_\bullet(\phi)^+$ has the form

$$0 \longrightarrow T_{\{1,2,3,4\}} \xrightarrow{\ \phi_3^+\ } T_{\{1,2\}} \oplus T_{\{1,3,4\}} \oplus T_{\{2,3,4\}} \xrightarrow{\ \phi_2^+\ } U_S \xrightarrow{\phi_1^+} W \longrightarrow 0.$$

In Example 3.11 we gave a basis for each of the nonzero T-spaces over the field $\mathbb{Q}$. In Example 4.5 we described where these basis elements get mapped under each of the homomorphisms ϕ_n^{IJ}. Putting this information together with the definitions of the maps ϕ_n^+ yields that in these bases $T_\bullet(\phi)^+$ can be written as

$$0 \longrightarrow \mathbb{Q} \xrightarrow[\begin{pmatrix} -1 \\ 1 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix}]{\phi_3^+=\phi_1} \mathbb{Q}^3 \xrightarrow[\begin{pmatrix} -1 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 2 & 2 \\ 0 & -1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}]{\phi_2^+=\phi_0} \mathbb{Q}^4 \xrightarrow[\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 2 & 3 \end{pmatrix}]{\phi_1^+=\phi} \mathbb{Q}^2 \longrightarrow 0.$$

It now straightforward to verify this is a complex that is a resolution of $\operatorname{Coker}(\phi)$.

6. The main properties of $T_\bullet(\phi)$ and $T_\bullet(\phi)^+$

As in the previous two sections, throughout this one we fix a representation map $\phi \colon\ U_S \longrightarrow W$ over a field $\Bbbk$ of a matroid $\mathbf{M}$ on a finite set S.

Our goal is to present the statements of all key results about the complexes $T_\bullet(\phi)$ and $T_\bullet(\phi)^+$. Their proofs are with a few exceptions technically involved and are given in later sections. In particular, this and the next sections can be considered as a summary of all the main results of this paper, and will serve as a useful reference to a reader who is not interested in the technical details of the proofs but would like to get a good overview of the essential features of our construction. However, since several interesting facts especially on the behaviour of multiplicity spaces have not been mentioned here, for those interested in a more detailed overview we recommmend to browse also through the statements of the results in Sections 8 through 11.

We begin with the following fundamental assertion, which justifies our use of the word "complex" in the definitions of $T_\bullet(\phi)$ and $T_\bullet(\phi)^+$.

Theorem 6.1. *The sequences $T_\bullet(\phi)$ and $T_\bullet(\phi)^+$ are complexes of vector spaces.*

Next, we describe the behaviour under the operation restriction of matroids. This property is a key ingredient in the proof of the second main result of this paper, Theorem 7.5.

Theorem 6.2. *Let Y be a subset of S. For $n \geq -1$ we define*

$$T_n\big|_Y \;=\; T_n(\phi)\big|_Y \;=\; \bigoplus_{\substack{I \in \mathcal{T}_n(\mathbf{M}) \\ I \subseteq Y}} T_I(\phi).$$

Similarly, we set $T_0^+\big|_Y = T_0^+ = W$, and for $n \geq 1$ we set $T_n^+\big|_Y = T_{n-2}\big|_Y$. Then:

(a) *The sequence of vector space maps*

$$T_\bullet(\phi)\big|_Y = 0 \to T_\lambda\big|_Y \xrightarrow{\phi_\lambda} T_{\lambda-1}\big|_Y \to \cdots \to T_1\big|_Y \xrightarrow{\phi_1} T_0\big|_Y \to 0$$

is a subcomplex of $T_\bullet(\phi)$, and we have $T_\bullet(\phi|Y) = T_\bullet(\phi)\big|_Y$.

(b) *The sequence of vector spaces and homomorphisms $T_\bullet(\phi)^+\big|_Y$ defined as*

$$0 \to T^+_{\lambda+2}\big|_Y \xrightarrow{\phi^+_{\lambda+2}} T^+_{\lambda+1}\big|_Y \longrightarrow \ldots \longrightarrow T_2^+\big|_Y \xrightarrow{\phi_2^+} T_1^+\big|_Y \xrightarrow{\phi_1^+} T_0^+\big|_Y \to 0$$

is a subcomplex of $T_\bullet(\phi)^+$, and we have $T_\bullet(\phi|Y)^+ = T_\bullet(\phi)^+\big|_Y$.

The content of Theorem 6.2 is probably best stated informally: to obtain the component in homological degree n of the (augmented) T-complex of $\phi|Y$, one simply needs to select from the degree n component of the corresponding complex of ϕ those T-spaces that are indexed by subsets of Y.

We also record the behavior under the operation sum of matroids:

Theorem 6.3. *If $S_1, \ldots, S_k$ are subsets of S such that $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{M}|S_1 + \cdots + \mathbf{M}|S_k$, then we have a canonical decomposition*

$$T_\bullet(\phi) = T_\bullet(\phi|S_1) \oplus \cdots \oplus T_\bullet(\phi|S_k)$$

of the T-complex of ϕ as a direct sum of subcomplexes.

Next comes the behavior under the operation contraction of matroids. This result together with Theorem 11.5 are the key ingredients in the proof of the first main result of this paper, Theorem 6.5.

Theorem 6.4. *Let Y be a subset of S such that $S \smallsetminus Y$ is independent in $\mathbf{M}$.*

There exists a canonical morphism of complexes $(\pi.Y)^\phi_\bullet : \; T_\bullet(\phi.Y) \longrightarrow T_\bullet(\phi)$ (described in a very explicit combinatorial way in Section 13) which is injective and an isomorphism in homology.

We finally arrive at the statement of the first main result of this paper, which asserts the acyclicity of our complexes.

Theorem 6.5. *The T-complex* $T_\bullet(\phi)$ *is a resolution of* $\operatorname{Ker}\phi$, *and the augmented T-complex* $T_\bullet(\phi)^+$ *is a resolution of* $\operatorname{Coker}\phi = W/V$.

As one of the important consequences of this theorem we have that the numerical characteristics of our complexes are independent from the representation ϕ.

Theorem 6.6. *For any subset* $A \subseteq S$ *the dimension of the multiplicity space* $S_A(\phi)$ *is an invariant of the matroid* $\mathbf{M}|A$, *and does not depend on the representation map* ϕ. *In particular, the length and the ranks of the components of the T-complex* $T_\bullet(\phi)$ *are invariants of the matroid* $\mathbf{M}$, *and do not depend on the representation map* ϕ.

We conclude this section with a result which will be of interest to group representation theorists. This theorem simply brings together properties that we have already observed in Remarks 2.5, 3.5, and 5.4.

Theorem 6.7. *Let* ϕ *be an* H*-equivariant representation of* $\mathbf{M}$.

Then for each $n \geq 0$ *we have canonically induced linear actions of* H *on the vector spaces* T_n *and* T_n^+ *such that the differentials of the complexes* $T_\bullet(\phi)$ *and* $T_\bullet(\phi)^+$ *are* H*-equivariant.* □

While leaving a more detailed investigation for a separate paper, we remark here that a situation as in Theorem 6.7 arises for example when $H = \Sigma_n$ is the symmetric group, the space W is an irreducible representation of H corresponding to some Young diagram Γ with n boxes, the set S is the collection of all row-standard tableaux of shape Γ with entries from 1 to n, and the map ϕ sends a row-standard tableau to the corresponding uniquely determined element of the irreducible representation W.

7. Free resolutions of multigraded modules

Throughout this section $R = \Bbbk[x_1, \ldots, x_m]$ is a polynomial ring over a field $\Bbbk$ with the standard $\mathbb{Z}^m$-grading, L is a Noetherian $\mathbb{Z}^m$-graded (multigraded) R-module,

$$E \xrightarrow{\Phi} G \longrightarrow L \longrightarrow 0$$

is a finite free multigraded presentation of L, and S is a multihomogeneous basis of E. The main goal is to introduce in Definition 7.3 a finite free complex of multigraded R-modules $T_\bullet(\Phi, S)$ which we call the *T-resolution of the pair* (Φ, S). In the second main result of this paper, Theorem 7.5, we show that the T-resolution of the pair (Φ, S) is a finite free resolution of the R-module L.

Before we proceed with the statements, we introduce some more notation. First, we consider the field $\Bbbk$ as an R-module via the canonical projection $R \longrightarrow \Bbbk$ that sends each variable x_i to the identity element $1 \in \Bbbk$. The set $\mathbb{Z}^m$ has a partial ordering $\preceq$ defined for sequences $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (a_1, \ldots, a_m)$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (b_1, \ldots, b_m)$ by the formula

$$\boldsymbol{\alpha} \preceq \boldsymbol{\beta} \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad a_i \leq b_i \text{ for every } i.$$

With this partial order $\mathbb{Z}^m$ is a lattice, the join (or lcm) of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ being their componentwise maximum

$$\operatorname{lcm}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta}) = \boldsymbol{\alpha} \vee \boldsymbol{\beta} = \big(\max(a_1, b_1), \ldots, \max(a_m, b_m)\big).$$

Similarly, the meet of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ is their componentwise minimum. When $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{N}^m$ we write $x^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ for the monomial $x_1^{a_1} \cdots x_m^{a_m} \in R$. If z is a multihomogeneous element inside a $\mathbb{Z}^m$-graded R-module, we write $\deg z$ for its multidegree. In particular,

$\deg(x^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}) = \boldsymbol{\alpha}$. More generally, if $A = \{z_1, \dots, z_k\}$ is a collection of multihomogeneous elements in a multigraded R-module, we set

$$\deg A = \operatorname{lcm}(\deg z_1, \dots, \deg z_k).$$

For example, since S is a collection of multihomogeneous elements in the multigraded R-module E, for any subset $I \subseteq S$ we have that $\deg I$ is the componentwise maximum of the multidegrees of the elements of I.

We are now ready to introduce the key ingredients from which the T-resolution of (Φ, S) is built. First is the representation of the matroid that governs the linear algebraic structure of our resolution.

Definition 7.1. (a) We define the $\Bbbk$-vector space W as

$$W = \Bbbk \otimes_R G.$$

(b) We note that the elements $\{1 \otimes_R a \mid a \in S\}$ form a basis of the $\Bbbk$-vector space $\Bbbk \otimes_R E$, and we set for each $a \in S$

$$e_a = 1 \otimes_R a.$$

We use this to identify canonically $\Bbbk \otimes_R E$ with the space U_S.

(c) We set $\phi = 1 \otimes_R \Phi$. Thus we have a $\Bbbk$-vector space homomorphism

$$\phi \colon\ U_S \longrightarrow W,$$

and we write $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{M}(\Phi, S)$ for the matroid on the set S represented over $\Bbbk$ by ϕ.

Next we introduce the components out of which we will construct the chains and the differentials for our resolution.

Definition 7.2. Let $n \geq -1$, and let I be an element in $\mathcal{T}_n(\mathbf{M})$.

(a) We define

$$T_I(\Phi, S) = R \otimes_{\Bbbk} T_I(\phi).$$

A canonical multigrading on this free R-module is defined by the formula

$$\deg(z \otimes v) = \deg z + \deg I$$

for any vector $v \in T_I(\phi)$ and any monomial $z \in R$.

(b) When $n \geq 0$ and J is an element of $\mathcal{T}_{n-1}(\mathbf{M})$ contained inside I, we define the canonical morphism of multigraded free R-modules

$$\Phi_{n+2}^{IJ} \colon\ T_I(\Phi, S) \longrightarrow T_J(\Phi, S)$$

by the formula

$$\Phi_{n+2}^{IJ}(z \otimes v) = x^{\deg I - \deg J} z \otimes \phi_n^{IJ}(v).$$

Finally, here is the definition of the T-resolution of the pair (Φ, S).

Definition 7.3. (a) We define $T_0(\Phi, S) = G$, while for $n \geq 1$ we define the multigraded free R-module

$$T_n(\Phi, S) = \bigoplus_{I \in \mathcal{T}_{n-2}(\mathbf{M})} T_I(\Phi, S).$$

Note that the module $T_1(\Phi, S)$ is simply the free R-module E.

(b) For $n \geq 1$ we define the morphism of multigraded free R-modules

$$\Phi_n \colon\ T_n(\Phi, S) \longrightarrow T_{n-1}(\Phi, S)$$

as follows. When $n \geq 2$ we define Φ_n by requiring that its restriction to the component $T_I(\Phi, S)$ of the module $T_n(\Phi, S)$ be given by the formula

$$\Phi_n\big|_{T_I(\Phi,S)} = \sum_{\substack{J \in \mathcal{T}_{n-3}(\mathbf{M}) \\ J \subseteq I}} (-1)^{|J|} \Phi_n^{IJ}.$$

When $n = 1$ we simply set $\Phi_1 = \Phi$.

(c) With $\lambda = |S| - r_S^{\mathbf{M}} + 1$, we define the sequence $T_\bullet(\Phi, S)$ as

$$T_\bullet(\Phi, S) = 0 \to T_\lambda(\Phi, S) \xrightarrow{\Phi_\lambda} T_{\lambda-1}(\Phi, S) \to \cdots \to T_1(\Phi, S) \xrightarrow{\Phi_1} T_0(\Phi, S) \to 0$$

and call it the *T-resolution of the presentation* Φ *with respect to the basis* S, or for short, the *T-resolution of* (Φ, S).

Remarks 7.4. (a) Suppose that a basis S can be chosen so that the matroid $\mathbf{M}(\Phi, S)$ is uniform (in the terminology of [6] this is the case of the map Φ having uniform rank). We saw in Example 5.7 that in such a situation the complex $T_\bullet(\phi)^+$ is canonically isomorphic to the Buchsbaum-Rim complex. It is now straightforward to verify from the definitions that this isomorphism carries through to give an isomorphism of the T-resolution $T_\bullet(\Phi, S)$ with the Taylor complex $T_\bullet(\Phi)$ from [6]. In particular the T-resolution of (Φ, S) is a free resolution of $L = \operatorname{Coker}(\Phi)$, and when Φ is the standard minimal presentation of R/I for a monomial ideal I and S is the basis of E whose elements map to the minimal generators of I, then the T-resolution of the pair (Φ, S) recovers the usual Taylor resolution of R/I.

(b) It is clear from part (a) that, just as the Taylor resolution, the complex $T_\bullet(\Phi, S)$ is in general not minimal. Furthermore, the ranks of its components depend substantially on the choice of the basis S. It is a very interesting open problem to investigate the properties of $T_\bullet(\Phi, S)$ under a "generic" choice of S.

The second main result of this paper is:

Theorem 7.5. *The sequence* $T_\bullet(\Phi, S)$ *is a complex, and is a finite free multigraded resolution of the* R*-module* $L = \operatorname{Coker}(\Phi)$.

Proof. As $\Phi_1 = \Phi$, we have $\operatorname{Coker}\Phi_1 = L$. Thus to prove the theorem it suffices to prove that the sequence $T = T_\bullet(\Phi, S)$ is a complex, and is acyclic, i.e. it has zero homology in positive homological degree. Since all the maps in the sequence $T = T_\bullet(\Phi, S)$ are morphisms of multigraded modules, T splits as a direct sum of sequences of multigraded vector spaces $T = \bigoplus_{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \in \mathbb{Z}^n} T_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$, where each $T_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ is a sequence of vector spaces, with all their vectors multihomogeneous of the same multidegree $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$. Thus it suffices to show that each sequence $T_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ is a complex of vector spaces and has zero homology in positive (homological) degree. Let $I_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ be the subset of S consisting of all elements of S with multidegree $\preceq \boldsymbol{\alpha}$. Since for an element $A \in \mathcal{T}_n(\mathbf{M})$ the R-module $T_A(\Phi, S)$ contributes to $T_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ if and only if $A \subseteq I_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$, in which case it contributes precisely $x^{\boldsymbol{\alpha} - \deg A} \otimes T_A(\phi)$, it is immediate that $T_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ can be canonically identified with a subcomplex of the restricted complex $T^+ = T_\bullet(\phi|I_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}})^+$, and that $T_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ and T^+ may possibly differ only in homological degree 0. Thus $T_{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}$ is a complex, and the desired acyclicity is now immediate from Theorem 6.5 applied to the restricted complex T^+. $\square$

As an interesting immediate consequence we obtain a nice upper bound on the projective dimension of a Noetherian multigraded R-module L. Further applications of Theorem 7.5 will appear in [7] and [16].

Theorem 7.6. *Let L be a multigraded Noetherian R-module of rank r, and let β_0 and β_1 be its zeroth and first Betti numbers, respectively.*

Then $\operatorname{pd}_R L \leq \beta_1 - \beta_0 + r + 1$.

Proof. Since in a minimal free presentation Φ of L one has $\beta_0 = \operatorname{rank} G$, and $\beta_1 = \operatorname{rank} E$, the result is immediate in view of Theorem 7.5 and the fact that the resolution $T_\bullet(\Phi, S)$ has length at most $\lambda = \beta_1 - (\beta_0 - r) + 1$. □

We conclude this section with an example.

Example 7.7. Let $R = \mathbb{Q}[x, y, z]$, and let G be the free multigraded R-module on a basis $\{g_1, g_2\}$ with

$$\begin{aligned} \deg(g_1) &= (1,1,0),\\ \deg(g_2) &= (0,0,1). \end{aligned}$$

Let E be the free multigraded R-module on a basis the set $S = \{1,2,3,4\}$ with

$$\begin{aligned} \deg(1) &= (3,1,1), \quad \deg(2) = (1,3,1),\\ \deg(3) &= (1,1,3), \quad \deg(4) = (1,2,2). \end{aligned}$$

Let $\Phi\colon\ E \longrightarrow G$ be the morphism given in these bases by the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} x^2z & y^2z & z^3 & yz^2 \\ x^3y & xy^3 & 2xyz^2 & 3xy^2z \end{pmatrix}.$$

Let $\gamma_1 = 1 \otimes g_1$ and $\gamma_2 = 1 \otimes g_2$ be the corresponding basis elements of the vector space $W = \mathbb{Q} \otimes_R G$. Thus the map

$$\phi = 1 \otimes_R \Phi\colon\ U_S \longrightarrow W$$

is the map we considered in Examples 1.5 and 2.8, and therefore the T-flats of the matroid $\mathbf{M}(\Phi, S)$ have multidegrees

$$\begin{aligned} \deg\{1,2\} &= (3,3,1), \qquad \deg\{1,3,4\} = (3,2,3),\\ \deg\{2,3,4\} &= (1,3,3), \quad \deg\{1,2,3,4\} = (3,3,3). \end{aligned}$$

It follows from Example 5.8 that for the T-resolution $T_\bullet(\Phi, S)$ we have

$$0 \longrightarrow T_3 \xrightarrow[\begin{pmatrix} -z^2 \\ y \\ -x^2 \end{pmatrix}]{\Phi_3} T_2 \xrightarrow[\begin{pmatrix} -y^2 & -yz^2 & 0 \\ x^2 & 0 & -z \\ 0 & 2x^2y & 2y^2 \\ 0 & -x^2z & -yz \end{pmatrix}]{\Phi_2} T_1 \xrightarrow[\begin{pmatrix} x^2z & y^2z & z^3 & yz^2 \\ x^3y & xy^3 & 2xyz^2 & 3xy^2z \end{pmatrix}]{\Phi_1 = \Phi} T_0 \longrightarrow 0.$$

It can now be verified directly that this is a free (and in this case minimal) multigraded resolution of the R-module $L = \operatorname{Coker}(\Phi)$.

8. T-flats of minors

In this section $\mathbf{M}$ is a matroid on a finite set S. We describe in Theorems 8.1 and 8.3 the relationship between the T-flats of $\mathbf{M}$ and the T-flats of the minors of $\mathbf{M}$. All results stated here are due to Tutte [17], and will play an essential role in the proofs of the main theorems of our paper. For completeness we have included their short proofs (which may differ from the arguments used in [17]).

Theorem 8.1. ([17]). *Let Y be a subset of S and let A be a subset of Y. Then:*

1. *The set A is a T-flat of $\mathbf{M}|Y$ if and only if A is a T-flat of $\mathbf{M}$. In that case the T-parts of A in $\mathbf{M}$ and in $\mathbf{M}|Y$ coincide.*

(2) *The set* A *is a T-flat of* $\mathbf{M}.Y$ *if and only if* $A = I \cap Y$ *for some T-flat* I *of* $\mathbf{M}$. *If* A *is a T-flat of* $\mathbf{M}.Y$ *then in fact* $A = B \cap Y$ *where* B *is the T-flat of* $\mathbf{M}$ *given by* $B = S \smallsetminus (Y \smallsetminus A)^{\mathsf{C}_{\mathbf{M}^*}}$.

Proof. Since the circuits of $\mathbf{M}|Y$ are precisely the circuits of $\mathbf{M}$ that are contained in Y, part (1) is immediate from Remark 2.2(c).

Next, A is a T-flat of $\mathbf{M}.Y$ precisely when $Y \smallsetminus A$ is a flat of $(\mathbf{M}.Y)^* = \mathbf{M}^*|Y$. This happens if and only if there is a flat I' of $\mathbf{M}^*$ with $Y \smallsetminus A = I' \cap Y$, in which case also $Y \smallsetminus A = (Y \smallsetminus A)^{\mathsf{C}_{\mathbf{M}^*}} \cap Y$. This in turn occurs if and only if $A = I \cap Y = B \cap Y$ where $I = S \smallsetminus I'$ and $B = S \smallsetminus (Y \smallsetminus A)^{\mathsf{C}_{\mathbf{M}^*}}$. $\square$

Remarks 8.2. ([17]). Let A be a T-flat of $\mathbf{M}.Y$ of level n, and $B = S \smallsetminus (Y \smallsetminus A)^{\mathsf{C}_{\mathbf{M}^*}}$.

(a) Since $(Y \smallsetminus A)^{\mathsf{C}_{\mathbf{M}^*}}$ is the unique smallest flat of $\mathbf{M}^*$ containing $Y \smallsetminus A$, the set B is the unique maximal T-flat of $\mathbf{M}$ whose intersection with Y is A.

(b) Since $r^{\mathbf{M}^*}_{S \smallsetminus B} = r^{\mathbf{M}^*}_{Y \smallsetminus A} = r^{\mathbf{M}^*|Y}_{Y \smallsetminus A} = r^{(\mathbf{M}.Y)^*}_{Y \smallsetminus A} = r^{(\mathbf{M}.Y)^*}_{Y} - n - 1 = r^{\mathbf{M}^*|Y}_{Y} - n - 1 = r^{\mathbf{M}^*}_{Y} - n - 1$, we obtain from (1.2) the equality

$$\ell^{\mathbf{M}}_{B} = n + r^{\mathbf{M}^*}_{S} - r^{\mathbf{M}^*}_{Y}.$$

In particular $\ell^{\mathbf{M}}_{B} \geq n$, and the set $S \smallsetminus Y$ is independent in $\mathbf{M}$ if and only if the set B is a T-flat in $\mathbf{M}$ of level exactly n.

Theorem 8.3. ([17]). *Let* $A \subseteq Y$ *be a T-flat of level* $n \geq 1$ *in the contracted matroid* $\mathbf{M}.Y$. *Let* $B = S \smallsetminus (Y \smallsetminus A)^{\mathsf{C}_{\mathbf{M}^*}}$, *and let* $J_1, \dots, J_k$ *be those of the T-parts of* B *in* $\mathbf{M}$ *that intersect* Y *nontrivially. Let* $I_i = J_i \cap Y$, *let* $A_i = A \smallsetminus I_i$, *and let* $B_i = B \smallsetminus J_i$.

Then the sets I_i *are all the T-parts of* A *in* $\mathbf{M}.Y$ *and* $B_i = S \smallsetminus (Y \smallsetminus A_i)^{\mathsf{C}_{\mathbf{M}^*}}$ *for each* i.

Proof. Let $B_i = B \smallsetminus J_i$ and $A_i = B_i \cap Y = A \smallsetminus I_i$. Thus by Theorem 8.1 the set A_i is a T-flat of $\mathbf{M}.Y$ and also $A_i = B'_i \cap Y$ for $B'_i = S \smallsetminus (Y \smallsetminus A_i)^{\mathsf{C}_{\mathbf{M}^*}}$, in particular $(Y \smallsetminus A)^{\mathsf{C}_{\mathbf{M}^*}} \neq (Y \smallsetminus A_i)^{\mathsf{C}_{\mathbf{M}^*}}$. Note furthermore that $Y \smallsetminus A_i = (S \smallsetminus B_i) \cap Y$ and $S \smallsetminus B_i$ is a cover in $\mathbf{M}^*$ of the flat $S \smallsetminus B = (Y \smallsetminus A)^{\mathsf{C}_{\mathbf{M}^*}}$. Since

$$S \smallsetminus B = (Y \smallsetminus A)^{\mathsf{C}_{\mathbf{M}^*}} \subsetneq (Y \smallsetminus A_i)^{\mathsf{C}_{\mathbf{M}^*}} \subseteq S \smallsetminus B_i,$$

it follows that $S \smallsetminus B_i = (Y \smallsetminus A_i)^{\mathsf{C}_{\mathbf{M}^*}}$. Therefore each A_i is a maximal T-flat of $\mathbf{M}.Y$ properly contained in A. Since $A = I_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup I_k$, the desired conclusion is immediate from Remark 2.2(b). $\square$

The following special case is of particular importance to us.

Corollary 8.4. *Let* $a \in S$ *be an element with* $\{a\}$ *independent in* $\mathbf{M}$, *and let* $S_a = S \smallsetminus \{a\}$. *Let* $A \subseteq S_a$, *and let* $B = S \smallsetminus (S_a \smallsetminus A)^{\mathsf{C}_{\mathbf{M}^*}}$. *Then* A *is a T-flat of* $\mathbf{M}.S_a$ *if and only if for the T-flat* B *of* $\mathbf{M}$ *we have* $B = A$ *or* $B = A \cup \{a\}$.

Furthermore, when A *is a T-flat of* $\mathbf{M}.S_a$ *we have:*

(1) *If* $B = A$ *then* $A \cup \{a\}$ *is not a T-flat of* $\mathbf{M}$, *the T-flats of* $\mathbf{M}$ *inside* B *coincide with the T-flats of* $\mathbf{M}.S_a$ *inside* A, *and* $r^{\mathbf{M}}_{A \cup \{a\}} = r^{\mathbf{M}}_{A} + 1$.

(2) *If* $B = A \cup \{a\}$ *and* A *is not a T-flat of* $\mathbf{M}$, *then* $\{a\}$ *is not a T-part of* B *and* $r^{\mathbf{M}}_{A \cup \{a\}} = r^{\mathbf{M}}_{A}$.

(3) *If* $B = A \cup \{a\}$ *and* A *is a T-flat of* $\mathbf{M}$, *then* $\{a\}$ *is a T-part of* B *and* $r^{\mathbf{M}}_{A \cup \{a\}} = r^{\mathbf{M}}_{A}$. $\square$

9. The structure of the T-parts of a T-flat

In this section $\mathbf{M}$ is a matroid on a finite set S. The main assertions on the structure of T-parts are Theorem 9.1, Theorem 9.5, and Theorem 9.8. The last of these theorems is essentially due to Tutte and is a straightforward consequence of the results in [17]. We proceed by first stating our three theorems together with some remarks, and then we present their proofs including for completeness a proof of Theorem 9.8.

Theorem 9.1. *Let I be a T-flat in $\mathbf{M}$ of level n, and let J be a T-part of I.*

(1) *If J is independent then $r_J + r_{I\smallsetminus J} = r_I + 1$.*
(2) *If J is not independent then J is a circuit, $n \geq 1$, and $r_J + r_{I\smallsetminus J} = r_I$.*
(3) *If J' is a proper subset of J then $r_{J'} + r_{I\smallsetminus J} = r_{J'\cup(I\smallsetminus J)}$.*

Remark 9.2. Let $\phi\colon\ U_S \longrightarrow W$ be a presentation of $\mathbf{M}$ and let J be a T-part of the T-flat I. In that setting the rank conditions from parts (1), (2), and (3) of Theorem 9.1 are equivalent to

(1) $\dim_{\Bbbk} V_J \cap V_{I\smallsetminus J} = 1$ when J is independent,
(2) $V_J \cap V_{I\smallsetminus J} = 0$ when J is a circuit, and
(3) $V_{J'} \cap V_{I\smallsetminus J} = 0$ when J' is a proper subset of J,

respectively.

The following useful remarks will be needed several times in later sections. Also, they should give the reader a better feel for the role played by T-parts when it comes down to linear algebra.

Remarks 9.3. Let $\phi\colon\ U_S \longrightarrow W$ be a presentation of $\mathbf{M}$, let I be a T-flat of level n, and let $I_1, \dots, I_k$ be all the T-parts of I. For each $1 \leq i \leq k$ let

$$u_i = \sum_{a\in I_i} c_{ia} e_a$$

be an arbitrary element of the vector space U_{I_i}. Also, let

$$V_i = V_{I_i} \cap V_{I\smallsetminus I_i}.$$

Furthermore, for each $1 \leq i \leq k$ let

$$v_i = \sum_{a\in I_i} d_{ia} e_a$$

be an element in U_{I_i} such that the vector $w_i = \phi(v_i)$ is a basis of the 1-dimensional space V_i in case I_i is independent, and such that v_i is a basis for the (1-dimensional) kernel of $\phi|I_i$ in case I_i is a circuit. Then:

(a) It is clear that the vectors v_i are uniquely determined up to a nonzero scalar multiple.

(b) If I_i is a circuit then $\phi(v_i) = 0$ and therefore $d_{ia} \neq 0$ for each $a \in I_i$.

(c) If I_i is independent then $0 \neq \phi(v_i) \in V_i$, hence there is a $0 \neq v' \in U_{I\smallsetminus I_i}$ such that $\phi(v_i + v') = 0$; therefore by Theorem 9.1(3) and Remark 9.2 it follows again that $d_{ia} \neq 0$ for each $a \in I_i$.

(d) If $n \geq 1$ and $\phi(\sum_i u_i) = 0$, then in view of the T-partition $I = I_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup I_k$ we have $\phi(u_i) \in V_i$ for each i, hence every u_i is a multiple of v_i. In particular, any syzygy of ϕ on U_I is a linear combination of the vectors v_i.

(e) If $n \geq 1$ and $\phi(\sum_i u_i) = 0$, then it is immediate from parts (b), (c), and (d) above that whenever $u_i \neq 0$ then also $c_{ia} \neq 0$ for every $a \in I_i$.

Remark 9.4. Let I be a T-flat of level $n \geq 2$ with T-partition $I = I_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup I_k$. Then for each j the set $I \smallsetminus I_j$ is a T-flat of level $n-1$ and can be written as

$$I \smallsetminus I_j = I_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup I_{j-1} \sqcup I_{j+1} \sqcup \cdots \sqcup I_k,$$

however in general this is *not* the T-partition of $I \smallsetminus I_j$. The next theorems are aimed at clarifying this issue further.

Theorem 9.5. *Let I be a T-flat in $\mathbf{M}$, and let J be a T-flat in $\mathbf{M}$ of level n properly contained inside I.*

The T-flat J is a disjoint union of T-parts of I. If in addition $n \geq 1$, then each T-part of J is the disjoint union of T-parts of I.

Corollary 9.6. *Let I be a T-flat in $\mathbf{M}$, and let J' be a T-part of I. There exists a circuit C inside I that contains J'.*

We will also need the following observations in Section 11.

Remarks 9.7. Let $\phi\colon\ U_S \longrightarrow W$ be a representation of $\mathbf{M}$, let $I = I_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup I_k$ be the T-partition of a T-flat I, and let the vectors $v_i \in U_{I_i}$ be chosen as in Remark 9.3. Let J be a T-flat of level n properly contained inside I, let J' be an independent T-part of J, and let $v \in U_{J'}$ be such that the vector $w = \phi(v)$ is a basis of the (1-dimensional) space $V' = V_{J'} \cap V_{J \smallsetminus J'}$. By Corollary 9.6 the set J' is contained in a circuit C inside J, and let

$$u = \sum_{a \in C} d_a e_a$$

be a basis vector of the 1-dimensional kernel of the map $\phi | C$. Then:

(a) By Remarks 9.3(a) and 9.3(b), the vectors v and u are uniquely determined up to a multiple by a nonzero scalar, and we have $d_a \neq 0$ for each $a \in C$.

(b) Since $\phi(u) = 0$, it follows from part (a) that the element $u' = \sum_{a \in J'} d_a e_a$ is a multiple of v.

(c) If $n \geq 1$ then by Theorem 9.5 the set J' is the disjoint union of T-parts of I, say $J' = I_{i_1} \sqcup \cdots \sqcup I_{i_t}$. Therefore, by Remark 9.3(d) for each $1 \leq p \leq t$ the partial sum $u'_p = \sum_{a \in I_{i_p}} d_a e_a$ is a multiple of v_{i_p}.

(d) Suppose $n \geq 1$. It is immediate from parts (b) and (c) above that v is a linear combination of the vectors v_{i_p}. Applying ϕ to that linear combination yields that w (and hence also the entire space V') lies inside the subspace $V_1 + \cdots + V_k$ of the vector space W.

Theorem 9.8. ([17]). *Let $I = I_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus I_k$ with $k \geq 2$ and each set I_i nonempty.*

1. *We have $\ell_I = \ell_{I_1} + \cdots + \ell_{I_k} + k - 1$.*
2. *The set I is a T-flat if and only if all the sets I_i are T-flats. In that case a subset J is a T-part of I if and only if either $J = I_i$ for some circuit I_i or J is a T-part of some I_i of level $\ell_{I_i} \geq 1$.*

The proofs of these theorems require some preparation. We turn our attention first to the proof of Theorem 9.1. We will need the following lemma.

Lemma 9.9. *Let I be a T-flat, and let $J \subsetneq I$ be a nonempty independent subset. Then $r_{I \smallsetminus J} + r_J \geq r_I + 1$.*

Proof. We induce on n, the level of I. In the case $n = 0$ the set I is a circuit, hence the set $I \smallsetminus J$ is independent. Therefore $r_{I \smallsetminus J} + r_J = |I \smallsetminus J| + |J| = |I| \geq r_I + 1$.

Assume next that $n \geq 1$ and that the lemma is true for T-flats of level $n-1$. Since $r_{I \smallsetminus J} + r_J \geq r_I$ always, we need to show that we cannot have equality in this formula. Assume that is not the case, i.e., assume we have $r_{I \smallsetminus J} + r_J = r_I$. Let $I = I_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup I_t$ be the T-partition of I. Then for some $1 \leq k \leq t$ the independent set $J' = J \cap I_k$ is not empty, and let $1 \leq j \leq t$ be an integer different from k. Since J is independent and J' is a subset of J we obtain $r_{I \smallsetminus J'} + r_{J'} = r_I$ by Lemma 16.7, and therefore $r_{(I \smallsetminus I_j) \smallsetminus J'} + r_{J'} = r_{I \smallsetminus I_j}$ by Lemma 16.9. This contradicts our induction hypothesis, because $I' = I \smallsetminus I_j$ is a T-flat of level $n-1$ and J' is a nonempty independent subset of I'. □

Proof of Theorem 9.1. Assume J is independent. Since I has level n and $I \smallsetminus J$ has level $n-1$, we have $r_J + r_{I \smallsetminus J} = |J| + |I \smallsetminus J| - |I| + r_I + 1 = r_I + 1$.

Next, assume that J is not independent, or equivalently that $|J| - r_J \geq 1$. Clearly $n \geq 1$, because otherwise I is a circuit, and J has to be idependent as a proper subset of I. Since $|I| - r_I = n + 1$ and $|I \smallsetminus J| - r_{I \smallsetminus J} = n$, we obtain that $|J| - r_I + r_{I \smallsetminus J} = 1$. Thus

$$1 \leq |J| - r_J = 1 + r_I - r_{I \smallsetminus J} - r_J \leq 1,$$

hence $|J| - r_J = 1$ and $r_J + r_{I \smallsetminus J} = r_I$. We need to show that J is a circuit. Assume not, and let J' be a circuit properly contained in J. Then $|J'| - r_{J'} = 1 = |J| - r_J$, hence Lemma 16.1 yields $0 \leq |J \smallsetminus J'| - r_{J \smallsetminus J'} \leq 1$. If $|J \smallsetminus J'| - r_{J \smallsetminus J'} = 1$, then by Lemma 16.2 we obtain $0 = |J' \cap (J \smallsetminus J')| - r_{J' \cap (J \smallsetminus J')} = 1$, a contradiction. Therefore $|J \smallsetminus J'| - r_{J \smallsetminus J'} = 0$, yielding that $J'' = J \smallsetminus J'$ is independent. Furthermore we have $r_{J'} + r_{J''} = r_{J'} + |J| - |J'| = r_J$. Since $r_{J'} + r_{I \smallsetminus J} = r_{I \smallsetminus J''}$ by Lemma 16.9, we obtain $r_{J''} + r_{I \smallsetminus J''} = r_{J''} + r_{J'} + r_{I \smallsetminus J} = r_J + r_{I \smallsetminus J} = r_I$, which contradicts Lemma 9.9.

Finally, let J' be a proper subset of J. Since J is either independent or a circuit the set J' is independent. If J is a circuit then $r_J + r_{I \smallsetminus J} = r_I$, hence $r_{J'} + r_{I \smallsetminus J} = r_{J' \cup (I \smallsetminus J)}$ by Lemma 16.9. If J is independent we get

$$r_{J' \cup (I \smallsetminus J)} \leq r_{J'} + r_{I \smallsetminus J} = r_I + 1 - r_{J \smallsetminus J'} \leq r_{I \smallsetminus (J \smallsetminus J')} = r_{J' \cup (I \smallsetminus J)},$$

where the last inequality follows from Lemma 9.9. This completes the proof of the theorem. □

Next, we begin work towards the proof of Theorem 9.5 and its corollary. We will need the following two lemmas.

Lemma 9.10. *Let I be a T-flat, and let J be a circuit properly contained in I such that $r_{I \smallsetminus J} + r_J = r_I$. Then $\ell_I \geq 1$, and J is a T-part of I.*

Proof. It is clear that $\ell_I \geq 1$ since I contains properly a circuit. Let $I = I_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup I_t$ be the T-partition of I and assume that J is not a T-part of I. Then for some k the set $J_k = I_k \cap J$ is a proper nonempty subset of both I_k and J. But then the set $J' = J \smallsetminus J_k$ is a nonempty independent subset of the level $n-1$ T-flat $I' = I \smallsetminus I_k$, and $r_{I' \smallsetminus J'} + r_{J'} = r_{I'}$ by Lemma 16.9. This contradicts Lemma 9.9. □

Lemma 9.11. *Let I be a T-flat, and let J be an independent subset of I such that $r_{I \smallsetminus J} + r_J = r_I + 1$. Then J is contained in a T-part of the T-flat I.*

Proof. The statement is obvious when I is a circuit, thus we assume that $\ell_I \geq 1$. Let $I = I_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup I_t$ be the T-partition of I. Suppose J is not contained in a T-part of I. Then for each k the set $J_k = J \cap I_k$ is either empty, or a proper subset of

J. Since J is not empty, J_k is not empty for some k. Then $J' = J \smallsetminus J_k$ is a nonempty independent subset of the T-flat $I' = I \smallsetminus I_k$, hence $r_{I' \smallsetminus J'} + r_{J'} \geq r_{I'} + 1$ by Lemma 9.9, and therefore $r_{I' \smallsetminus J'} + r_{J'} = r_{I'} + 1$ by Lemma 16.4. But then Lemma 16.5 yields $r_{I \smallsetminus J_k} + r_{J_k} = r_I$, which contradicts Lemma 9.9. ☐

Proof of Theorem 9.5. It suffices to prove the theorem in the case when the level of I is $n+1$. The first assertion is then clear, since J is obtained by the removal of a single T-part of I. To prove the second assertion, assume $n \geq 1$ and let J' be a T-part of I different from $I' = I \smallsetminus J$. It suffices to prove that J' is contained in a T-part of J. If J' is a circuit, then we have $r_{J'} + r_{I \smallsetminus J'} = r_I$ by Theorem 9.1(2), hence from Lemma 16.9 we obtain $r_{J'} + r_{J \smallsetminus J'} = r_J$. Therefore J' is a T-part of the T-flat I' by Lemma 9.10. If J' is independent, then from Theorem 9.1(1) we have $r_{J'} + r_{I \smallsetminus J'} = r_I + 1$, hence $r_{J'} + r_{J \smallsetminus J'} = r_J + 1$ by Lemma 9.9 and Lemma 16.4. Therefore J' is contained in a T-part of J by Lemma 9.11. ☐

Proof of Corollary 9.6. We induce on the level n of I. Let J'' be a T-part of I different from J'. When $n = 0$ then I itself is the desired circuit. When $n = 1$ the set $C = I \smallsetminus J''$ is a circuit containing J. Assume $n \geq 2$ and that the result is true for $n - 1$. Then the set $I' = I \smallsetminus J''$ is a T-flat of level $n-1$, and contains J'. Therefore J' is contained in a T-part of I' by Theorem 9.5, hence in a circuit C inside $I' \subset I$ by the induction hypothesis. ☐

Finally, we proceed with the proof of Theorem 9.8. The next lemma is a needed ingredient.

Lemma 9.12. *Let I and J be disjoint sets such that $r_I + r_J = r_{I \cup J}$. If I' is a T-flat of $\mathbf{M}$ inside $I \cup J$ such that $I' \cap I \neq \varnothing$ then the set $I' \cap I$ is a T-flat of $\mathbf{M}$.*

Proof. Let J' be a T-part of I' that contains elements of J. By induction on the size of I' it is enough to show that J' is contained in J. Since I' is a T-flat, by Corollary 9.6 there is a circuit C in I' that contains J'. Therefore by Lemma 16.11 the set C, hence also J', is inside the set J. ☐

Proof of Theorem 9.8. (1) We have $\ell_I = |I| - r_I - 1 = \sum_{i=1}^{k} |I_i| - \sum_{i=1}^{k} r_{I_i} - 1 = \sum_{i=1}^{k} (\ell_{I_i} + 1) - 1 = \ell_{I_1} + \cdots + \ell_{I_k} + k - 1$.

(2) Assume first that $k = 2$. In that case if $I = I_1 \oplus I_2$ is a T-flat, then I_1 and I_2 are T-flats by Lemma 9.12. Conversely, if both I_1 and I_2 are T-flats then so is $I = I_1 \oplus I_2$ by Remark 2.2(c). The first assertion of part (2) now follows from the case $k = 2$ by an elementary induction.

Next we consider the second assertion. Since $k \geq 2$ and by the first assertion each set I_i is a T-flat, we have that $n = \ell_I \geq 1$. Furthermore, if I_i is a circuit then it is a T-part of I by Lemma 9.10. Since I is the disjoint union of its T-parts, to complete the proof it suffices by Remark 2.2(b) to show that when J is a T-part of some non-circuit I_j then the set $I \smallsetminus J$ is a T-flat of level $n-1$. Let $I' = \bigoplus_{i \neq j} I_i$. Then $I = I' \oplus I_j$ and by Lemma 16.9 we get $I \smallsetminus J = I' \oplus (I_j \smallsetminus J)$. Therefore $I \smallsetminus J$ is a T-flat by the first assertion and we have by part (1)

$$\ell_{I \smallsetminus J} = \ell_{I'} + \ell_{I_j \smallsetminus J} + 1 = \ell_{I'} + (\ell_{I_j} - 1) + 1 = \ell_I - 1 = n - 1,$$

which is the desired equality. ☐

10. Connected T-flats and multiplicity spaces

In this section $\mathbf{M}$ is a matroid on a finite set S. The following theorems describe the structure of the connected T-flats of $\mathbf{M}$.

Theorem 10.1. *Let I be a connected set of level $n \geq 0$.*

1. *The set I is a T-flat, and every T-part of I is independent.*
2. *The T-parts of I are all the maximal elements of the partially ordered set*
$$\{J \mid J \text{ is an independent subset of } I \text{ with } r_{I \smallsetminus J} + r_J = r_I + 1\},$$
where the partial ordering is by inclusion.

Proof. (1) Let I' be the union of all circuits contained in I. Since $n \geq 0$ the set I' is nonempty hence a T-flat, and is clearly the unique maximal T-flat contained in I. Furthermore, the set $I \smallsetminus I'$ contains no circuits, hence is independent, and also no circuit in I intersects $I \smallsetminus I'$. It follows that $I = (I \smallsetminus I') \oplus I'$, and by the connectedness of I we get $I = I'$, therefore I is a T-flat. Let J be a T-part of I. If J is not independent, then by Theorem 9.1 it is a circuit and $r_J + r_{I \smallsetminus J} = r_I$. Thus $I = J \oplus (I \smallsetminus J)$ which contradicts the connectedness of I.

(2) This is immediate from part (1), Theorem 9.1, and Lemma 9.11. □

As direct corollary of the proof above we have

Corollary 10.2. *Let A be a subset of S, and let I be the union of all circuits contained in A (in particular I is empty when A is independent, and is the unique maximal T-flat contained inside A otherwise). Let $J = A \smallsetminus I$.*

The set J is independent, and $A = I \oplus J$. □

The next result plays a key role in the characterization of connected sets via their multiplicity spaces. It is due to Tutte and is a straightforward consequence of [17, p. 148, (3.3)]. For completeness, we provide a (different) proof.

Theorem 10.3. ([17]). *Let I be a connected T-flat of level $n \geq 1$. Then I contains a connected T-flat of level $n-1$.*

Proof. We induce on n. When $n = 1$ the result is immediate because circuits are connected, so we assume that $n \geq 2$ and that the result holds for connected T-flats of smaller levels. Pick a T-part J of I such that $I \smallsetminus J$ has a connected component of lowest possible level. Thus by Proposition 16.12 and Theorem 9.8 the T-flat $I \smallsetminus J$ decomposes as
$$I \smallsetminus J = J_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus J_p$$
for some connected T-flats J_i, where J_1 is the connected component of lowest possible level. Note that if $p = 1$ then we are done, thus for the rest of this proof we assume that $p \geq 2$.

We select a subset C_1 of J_1 as follows: if J_1 is circuit we take $C_1 = J_1$, otherwise we choose C_1 to be a T-part of J_1 such that $J_1 \smallsetminus C_1$ is a connected T-flat (a T-part like that exists by our induction hypothesis). Thus by Theorem 9.8 the set C_1 is a T-part of $I \smallsetminus J$, while by Theorem 9.5 we have that C_1 is a union of T-parts of I. Let J' be one of these T-parts. Then $I \smallsetminus J'$ is a T-flat of level $n-1$ and contains the level $n-2$ T-flat $(I \smallsetminus J) \smallsetminus C_1$. Therefore $C_1' = (C_1 \smallsetminus J') \cup J$ is a T-part of the T-flat $I \smallsetminus J'$.

We claim that $I \smallsetminus J'$ is a connected T-flat. Suppose not, and let
$$I \smallsetminus J' = I_1' \oplus \cdots \oplus I_t'$$

with $t \geq 2$, each I'_j a connected T-flat, and C'_1 contained in I'_1. Since by Lemma 16.9 and Proposition 16.10 we have

$$(I'_1 \smallsetminus C'_1) \oplus I'_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus I'_t = (I \smallsetminus J') \smallsetminus C'_1 = (I \smallsetminus J) \smallsetminus C_1 = (J_1 \smallsetminus C_1) \oplus J_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus J_p,$$

it follows from Lemma 16.11, Theorem 16.12, and the connectedness of I'_2 that I'_2 equals one of the connected components $J_1 \smallsetminus C_1$ or J_i for some $i \geq 2$. In particular, either $J_1 \smallsetminus C_1$ or J_i for some $i \geq 2$ is a connected component of $I \smallsetminus J'$. However, $J_1 \smallsetminus C_1$ cannot be a connected component of $I \smallsetminus J'$ because of the minimality property of J. Thus without loss of generality we may assume that J_2 is a connected component of $I \smallsetminus J'$. Then $r_{J_2} + r_{(I \smallsetminus J') \smallsetminus J_2} = r_{I \smallsetminus J'}$, and $r_{J_2} + r_{I \smallsetminus J_2} \geq r_I + 1$ because I is connected. However, J_1 is a T-flat containing the independent by Theorem 10.1 T-part J' of I, and disjoint from J_2. Thus by Theorem 9.1 and Lemma 16.4 we have $r_{J'} + r_{J_1 \smallsetminus J'} = r_{J_1} + 1$. Therefore $r_I - r_{I \smallsetminus J'} = r_{J_1} - r_{J_1 \smallsetminus J'}$ and we have inclusions $J' \subseteq J_1 \subseteq I \smallsetminus J_2 \subseteq I$. It follows that $r_{J_1} - r_{J_1 \smallsetminus J'} = r_{I \smallsetminus J_2} - r_{(I \smallsetminus J_2) \smallsetminus J'}$ by Lemma 16.6. This yields $r_I - r_{J_1} + r_{J_1 \smallsetminus J'} - r_{(I \smallsetminus J') \smallsetminus J_2} = r_I - r_{I \smallsetminus J_2}$. From here we get $r_I - r_{J'} + 1 - r_{(I \smallsetminus J') \smallsetminus J_2} = r_I - r_{I \smallsetminus J_2}$, hence $r_{I \smallsetminus J'} - r_{(I \smallsetminus J') \smallsetminus J_2} = r_I - r_{I \smallsetminus J_2}$. Therefore we obtain

$$0 = r_{J_2} + r_{(I \smallsetminus J') \smallsetminus J_2} - r_{I \smallsetminus J'} = r_{J_2} + r_{I \smallsetminus J_2} - r_I \geq 1,$$

yielding the desired contradiction. Thus the T-flat $I \smallsetminus J'$ is connected, hence the connected T-flat I contains a connected T-flat of level $n - 1$. □

Proposition 10.4. *Let A be a T-flat of level n which is not connected, and let I be a connected T-flat of level $n - 1$ inside A. Then the T-part $A \smallsetminus I$ is a circuit.*

Proof. By Lemma 16.11, Proposition 16.12, Theorem 9.8, and the fact that A is not connected, the connected T-flat I is a connected component of A, we have $A = (A \smallsetminus I) \oplus I$, and $A \smallsetminus I$ is a T-flat of level 0 hence a citcuit. □

Finally, let $\phi\colon\ U_S \longrightarrow W$ be a representation of the matroid $\mathbf{M}$ over a field $\Bbbk$. We have the following important characterization of connected T-flats in terms of their multiplicity spaces.

Theorem 10.5. *We have $S_I(\phi) \neq 0$ if and only if I is a connected T-flat.*

Proof. To prove the "only if" part of the theorem we assume that I is not a connected T-flat and we will show that $S_I(\phi) = 0$. This is clear from the definition if I is not a T-flat, so we assume that I is a T-flat but is not connected. Let n be the level of I. Since the T-flat I is not connected, we have $n \geq 1$. We prove our assertion by induction on n. When $n = 1$ the non-connected T-flat I must by Theorem 9.8 and Theorem 16.12 have a decomposition into connected components of the form $I = I_1 \oplus I_2$ with I_1 and I_2 circuits, in particular $I = I_1 \sqcup I_2$ is the T-partition of I. Thus by Remark 9.2 we have $V_{I_1} \cap V_{I_2} = 0$, hence from Definition 3.3 we get $S_I = V_{I_1} \cap V_{I_2} = 0$. Therefore we assume $n \geq 2$ and that our assertion is true for T-flats of level $n - 1$. In view of the surjectivity of the map (3.7), it is enough to show that for each T-flat J of level $n - 1$ in I we have either $V_J \cap V_{I \smallsetminus J} = 0$ or $S_J = 0$. Since I is not connected, by Theorem 9.8 and Theorem 16.12 the T-part $I \smallsetminus J$ is either a circuit, or is a T-part of one of the connected components A of I with $\ell_A \geq 1$, and we have a non-trivial direct sum decomposition $I = A \oplus (I \smallsetminus A)$. If $I \smallsetminus J$ is a circuit, then by Theorem 9.1 and Remark 9.2 we have $V_{I \smallsetminus J} \cap V_J = 0$. If $I \smallsetminus J$ is not a circuit, then by Lemma 16.9 we get a non-trivial direct sum decomposition $J = A \smallsetminus (I \smallsetminus J) \oplus I \smallsetminus A$, yielding that the T-flat J is not connected. Therefore by our induction hypothesis $S_J = 0$, which completes the proof of our assertion, hence of the "only if" part of the theorem.

To prove the "if" part of the theorem we again induce on n, the level of I. The result is trivial for $n = 0$, thus we assume that $n \geq 1$ and that the assertion is true for connected T-flats of level $n-1$. By Theorem 10.1 for each T-flat J of level $n-1$ in I the space $V_J \cap V_{I \smallsetminus J}$ is 1-dimensional. In view of the injectivity of the map ν, it is enough to show that for some T-flat J of level $n-1$ in I the multiplicity space S_J is not zero. By Theorem 10.3 the connected T-flat I contains a connected T-flat J of level $n-1$. Therefore $S_J \neq 0$ by our induction hypothesis. □

11. Multiplicity spaces for minors

In this section $\phi\colon\ U_S \longrightarrow W$ is a representation over $\Bbbk$ of a matroid $\mathbf{M}$ on a finite set S. We study the relationship between the multiplicity spaces of $\mathbf{M}$ and the multiplicity spaces of the minors of $\mathbf{M}$. We also present (modulo Theorem 6.1) the proofs of Theorem 6.2 and Theorem 6.3.

We begin with the (relatively simpler) behavior under the operation restriction.

Theorem 11.1. *Let Y be a subset of S, and let I be a subset of level n in Y.*

1. *$I \in \mathcal{T}_n(\mathbf{M}|Y)$ if and only if $I \in \mathcal{T}_n(\mathbf{M})$.*
2. *$S_I(\phi) = S_I(\phi|Y)$ and $T_I(\phi) = T_I(\phi|Y)$.*
3. *If $I \in \mathcal{T}_n(\mathbf{M})$ and $J \subseteq I$ is an element of $\mathcal{T}_{n-1}(\mathbf{M})$ then $\phi_n^{IJ} = (\phi|Y)_n^{IJ}$.*

Proof. When $n = -1$ part (1) is immediate from the definitions. When $n \geq 0$ part (1) is immediate by Theorem 8.1. It follows from that same theorem that a chain $\mathbb{I}$ is in $C_{\mathbf{M}}(I)$ if and only if it is a chain in $C_{\mathbf{M}|Y}(I)$. Since for any subset $A \subseteq Y$ the spaces U_A and V_A are the same for ϕ and for $\phi|Y$, part (2) follows from the definitions of multiplicity space and T-space. Part (3) is now also clear, since all spaces and maps appearing in the definitions of ϕ_n^{IJ} and $(\phi|Y)_n^{IJ}$ are the same. □

We are now ready to give the proofs of Theorem 6.2 and Theorem 6.3.

Proof of Theorem 6.2. It is immediate from Theorem 11.1(2) that for each $n \geq 0$ we have $T_n(\phi|Y) = T_n(\phi)\big|_Y$ and $T_n^+(\phi|Y) = T_n^+(\phi)\big|_Y$. Similarly, from Theorem 11.1(3) we obtain for each $n \geq 1$ that $\phi_n\big|_{T_n|_Y} = (\phi|Y)_n$ and $\phi_n^+\big|_{T_n^+|_Y} = (\phi|Y)_n^+$. The desired conclusion now follows in view of Theorem 6.1. □

Proof of Theorem 6.3. The inclusion $\supseteq$ is clear from Theorem 6.2. If a T-flat A of $\mathbf{M}$ is not contained in some S_i, then we have by Lemma 16.9 a nontrivial decomposition $A = A \cap S_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus A \cap S_k$, and therefore $T_A(\phi) = 0$ by Theorem 10.5. The desired equality of complexes is now immediate. □

Next, we turn our attention to the significantly more complicated behavior of multiplicity spaces under the operation contraction.

Theorem 11.2. *Let Y be a subset of S with $S \smallsetminus Y$ independent in $\mathbf{M}$, let $A \subseteq Y$ be a T-flat of $\mathbf{M}.Y$ of level n, let $B = S \smallsetminus (Y \smallsetminus A)^{\mathsf{C}_{\mathbf{M}^*}}$, let $\overline{W} = W/V_{S \smallsetminus Y}$, and let $\pi\colon\ W \longrightarrow \overline{W}$ be the canonical projection map.*

Then the canonical surjection of symmetric powers $\pi_n\colon\ S_n W \longrightarrow S_n\overline{W}$ induces by restriction a surjection of multiplicity spaces $\pi_{Y,A}^{\phi} = \pi_{Y,A}\colon\ S_B(\phi) \longrightarrow S_A(\phi.Y)$.

Proof. Note that by Remark 8.2(b) the set B is a T-flat in $\mathbf{M}$ of level n. Let $\mathbb{I}$ be a chain $I^{(0)} \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq I^{(n)}$ in $C_{\mathbf{M}}(B)$ and for each k let $J^{(k)} = I^{(k)} \cap Y$. Since $S \smallsetminus Y$ is independent, each set $J^{(k)}$ is nonempty. Let $C^Y_{\mathbf{M}}(B)$ be the collection of all chains in $C_{\mathbf{M}}(B)$ such that $J^{(k)}$ and $J^{(k-1)}$ are distinct for every $k \geq 1$. Note that if $\mathbb{I}$ is not in $C^Y_{\mathbf{M}}(B)$ then for some $k \geq 1$ we have $J^{(k)} = J^{(k-1)}$, hence $I^{(k)} \smallsetminus I^{(k-1)} \subseteq S \smallsetminus Y$; therefore $V(\mathbb{I}) \subseteq V_{S\smallsetminus Y}(\phi)S^{n-1}W$, yielding that $\pi_n\big(V(\mathbb{I})\big) = 0$. On the other hand if $\mathbb{I}$ is in $C^Y_{\mathbf{M}}(B)$ then by Theorem 8.1 and Remark 8.2(b) each set $J^{(k)}$ is a T-flat in $\mathbf{M}.Y$ of level k; thus intersection with Y produces a chain $\mathbb{I} \cap Y$ in $C_{\mathbf{M}.Y}(A)$, and, by Theorem 8.3, every chain in $C_{\mathbf{M}.Y}(A)$ can be obtained in this way from a chain in $C^Y_{\mathbf{M}}(B)$.

Next, assume $\mathbb{I}$ is in $C^Y_{\mathbf{M}}(B)$ and consider the set $I_k = I^{(k)} \smallsetminus I^{(k-1)}$. It is a T-part of $I^{(k)}$, and the nonempty set $J_k = I_k \cap Y$ is a T-part of $J^{(k)}$ in $\mathbf{M}.Y$. Recall that J_k is independent in $\mathbf{M}.Y$ if and only if $J_k \cup L$ is independent in $\mathbf{M}$ for every independent in $\mathbf{M}$ subset L of $S \smallsetminus Y$. Therefore if J_k is independent in $\mathbf{M}.Y$ we have $V_{J_k}(\phi) \cap V_{S\smallsetminus Y}(\phi) = 0$, and also

$$V_{I_k}(\phi) \cap V_{S\smallsetminus Y}(\phi) = V_{I_k \smallsetminus J_k}(\phi).$$

Furthermore, for each I the space $V_I(\phi)$ maps under π onto $V_{I\cap Y}(\phi.Y)$. This induces for each $k \geq 1$ a map

$$\pi^{(k)}\colon\ V_{I^{(k-1)}}(\phi) \cap V_{I_k}(\phi) \longrightarrow V_{J^{(k-1)}}(\phi.Y) \cap V_{J_k}(\phi.Y).$$

We claim that $\pi^{(k)}$ is surjective. Indeed, if J_k is not independent in $\mathbf{M}.Y$ then $V_{J^{(k-1)}}(\phi.Y) \cap V_{J_k}(\phi.Y) = 0$, hence $\pi^{(k)}$ is surjective in that case. Assume that J_k is independent in $\mathbf{M}.Y$. Then $V_{J^{(k-1)}}(\phi.Y) \cap V_{J_k}(\phi.Y)$ is a 1-dimensional vector space, and I_k is independent in $\mathbf{M}$. Since the kernel of $\pi^{(k)}$ is the space

$$\ker \pi^{(k)} = V_{I^{(k-1)}}(\phi) \cap V_{I_k}(\phi) \cap V_{S\smallsetminus Y}(\phi)$$

and $V_{I^{(k-1)}}(\phi) \cap V_{I_k}(\phi)$ is 1-dimensional, to prove surjectivity it is enough to show that $V_{I^{(k-1)}}(\phi) \cap V_{I_k}(\phi) \cap V_{S\smallsetminus Y}(\phi) = 0$. Since $I' = I_k \smallsetminus J_k$ is a strict subset of the independent T-part I_k, we have by Theorem 9.1 that $r^{\mathbf{M}}_{I' \cup I^{(k-1)}} = r^{\mathbf{M}}_{I'} + r^{\mathbf{M}}_{I^{(k-1)}}$. Therefore

$$V_{I^{(k-1)}}(\phi) \cap V_{I_k}(\phi) \cap V_{S\smallsetminus Y}(\phi) = V_{I^{(k-1)}}(\phi) \cap V_{I'}(\phi) = 0,$$

completing the proof of our claim.

It follows that for each chain $\mathbb{I}$ in $C^Y_{\mathbf{M}}(B)$ the space $V(\mathbb{I})$ is mapped under π_n surjectively onto the space $V(\mathbb{I} \cap Y)$. Since every chain in $C_{\mathbf{M}.Y}(A)$ comes from a chain in $C^Y_{\mathbf{M}}(B)$, and $\pi_n\big(V(\mathbb{I})\big) = 0$ when $\mathbb{I}$ is not in $C^Y_{\mathbf{M}}(B)$, it is clear from the definitions that $\pi_n(S_B(\phi)) = S_A(\phi.Y)$. □

Remark 11.3. Let $Y \subseteq Y_1$ be subsets of S such that $S \smallsetminus Y$ is independent, let A be a T-flat of $\mathbf{M}.Y$, let $B = S \smallsetminus (Y \smallsetminus A)^{\mathsf{C}_{\mathbf{M}^*}}$, and let $A_1 = Y_1 \cap B$. It is straightforward to verify that $\phi.Y = (\phi.Y_1).Y$, that $\pi^{\phi}_{Y} = \pi^{\phi.Y_1}_{Y} \circ \pi^{\phi}_{Y_1}$, and therefore we have

$$\pi^{\phi}_{Y,A} = \pi^{\phi.Y_1}_{Y,A} \circ \pi^{\phi}_{Y_1,A_1}.$$

In particular, to study the properties of the maps $\pi^{\phi}_{Y,*}$ one may contract one element at a time. We examine this situation in more detail in the following two theorems.

Theorem 11.4. *Let $a \in S$ with $\{a\}$ independent in $\mathbf{M}$, let $A \subseteq S_a$ be a T-flat of $\mathbf{M}.S_a$, and let $B = S \smallsetminus (S_a \smallsetminus A)^{\mathsf{C}_{\mathbf{M}^*}}$. Then:*

1. *If the set* $\{a\}$ *is not a T-part of* B *in* $\mathbf{M}$ *then the surjective homomorphism* $\pi_{S_a,A}\colon\ S_B(\phi) \longrightarrow S_A(\phi.S_a)$ *is an isomorphism.*
2. *If the set* $\{a\}$ *is a T-part of* B *then we have a canonical complex*

$$0 \longrightarrow S_A(\phi)\otimes V_a(\phi) \xrightarrow{\ \nu\ } S_B(\phi) \xrightarrow{\ \pi_{S_a,A}\ } S_A(\phi.S_a) \longrightarrow 0$$

of vector spaces over the field $\Bbbk$.

Proof. (1) It suffices to show that $S_B(\phi)$ and $S_A(\phi.S_a)$ have the same dimension. Note that $(\mathbf{M}.S_a)|A = (\mathbf{M}|A\cup a).A$, and similarly $(\phi.S_a)|A = (\phi|A\cup a).A$. Since by Corollary 8.4 we have $B \subseteq A\cup a$, in view of Theorem 8.1 and Theorem 11.1 we may assume that $S = A \cup a$ (hence also $S_a = A$).

Suppose now that $a \notin B$. Then by Corollary 8.4 we have $B = A$, and $r_S^{\mathbf{M}} = r_B^{\mathbf{M}} + r_a^{\mathbf{M}}$. Therefore $\mathbf{M} = \mathbf{M}|B + \mathbf{M}|a$, and it is straightforward to verify that in such a situation we have $W = V_B(\phi)\oplus V_a(\phi)\oplus W'$ for some subspace W'. It follows that the kernel of the map $\pi_n\colon\ S_nW \longrightarrow S_n\overline{W}$ does not intersect $S_nV_B(\phi)$, hence the induced map $\pi_{S_a,A}\colon\ S_B(\phi)\longrightarrow S_A(\phi.A)$ is injective, therefore an isomorphism by Theorem 11.1 as desired.

Consider now the remaining case $B = A\cup a$. If B is a circuit in $\mathbf{M}$ then so is A in $\mathbf{M}.A$, and the desired equality of dimensions is immediate from the definitions. Thus we assume in the sequel that B has level $\ell_B^{\mathbf{M}} \geq 1$. Let $B = I_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup I_k$ be the T-partition of B, and let $I = I_k$ be the T-part of B that contains (properly) a. For each i let $B_i = B \smallsetminus I_i$ and let $V_i = V_{B_i}(\phi)\cap V_{I_i}(\phi)$. Thus each V_i is either 0 or 1-dimensional, and it follows from Remark 9.7(d) that the space $S_B(\phi)$ is contained inside the subalgebra of the symmetric algebra $S(W)$ generated by the subspace $\widetilde{W} = V_1 + \cdots + V_k \subset W$. Note that the nonzero vector $\epsilon_a = \phi(a)$ is not in $\widetilde{W}$. Indeed, otherwise we would have $\epsilon_a = v_1 + \cdots + v_k$ with each $v_i \in V_i$, hence $\epsilon_a - c_kv_k \in V_k$; thus $\epsilon_a \in V_k$ and therefore $0 \neq \epsilon_a \in V_{B_k}(\phi)\cap V_a(\phi)$ which contradicts Theorem 9.1(3). It follows that $(\epsilon_aS_{n-1}W)\cap S_B(\phi) = 0$, hence the map $\pi_{S_a,A}$ is injective as desired.

(2) We have by Corollary 8.4 that $A = B \smallsetminus \{a\}$ is a T-flat in $\mathbf{M}$. Also, since $\{a\}$ is independent, we have that $V_A(\phi)\cap V_a(\phi)$ is 1-dimensional, therefore equals $V_a(\phi)$. Finally, since the kernel of $\pi_{S_a,A}$ is the space $(\epsilon_aS_{n-1}W)\cap S_B(\phi)$, the desired conclusion is immediate from the definitions. □

We close this section with the statement of a key result that strengthens the conclusion of part (2) of Theorem 11.4. We postpone the proof till Section 15.

Theorem 11.5. *Let* $a \in S$ *with* $\{a\}$ *independent in* $\mathbf{M}$, *let* $A \subseteq S_a$ *be a T-flat of* $\mathbf{M}.S_a$, *and let* $B = S \smallsetminus (S_a \smallsetminus A)^{\mathsf{C}_{\mathbf{M}^*}}$. *If* $\{a\}$ *is a T-part of* B *then*

$$0 \longrightarrow S_A(\phi)\otimes V_a(\phi) \xrightarrow{\ \nu\ } S_B(\phi) \xrightarrow{\ \pi_{S_a,A}\ } S_A(\phi.S_a) \longrightarrow 0$$

is an exact sequence of vector spaces.

12. $T_\bullet(\phi)$ AND $T_\bullet(\phi)^+$ ARE COMPLEXES

In this section $\phi\colon\ U_S \longrightarrow W$ is a representation over $\Bbbk$ of a matroid $\mathbf{M}$ on a finite set S. Our goal is to give the proof of Theorem 6.1. The main ingredient in the proof is the following result.

Theorem 12.1. *Let I be a T-flat of level $n \geq 1$ and let $A \subset I$ be an element of $\mathcal{T}_{n-2}(\mathbf{M})$. Let $J_1, \dots, J_k$ be the T-flats of level $n-1$ inside I that contain A. Then*

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k} (-1)^{|J_j|} \phi_{n-1}^{J_j A} \circ \phi_n^{I J_j} = 0.$$

The proof of this theorem relies on explicit computations. In order for us to do these computations effectively, we will need to fix a linear ordering with certain properties on the elements of the T-flat I. The exact properties required from this ordering will be specified later, but once an ordering has been fixed, we will use the following notation.

Definition 12.2. Let I be a set of level n with a fixed linear oredring on its elements.

(a) If I is independent we set $\widehat{I} = I$.

(b) If I is a T-flat, we introduce the following objects. Let $I^{(0)} = I$, and let $i^{(0)}$ be the smallest element of $I^{(0)}$. Proceeding inductively on r, given we have already defined $I^{(r)}$ and $i^{(r)}$ for some $0 \leq r < n$, we write $I^{(r+1)}$ for the only T-flat of level $n-r-1$ inside $I^{(r)}$ that does not contain $i^{(r)}$ and set $i^{(r+1)}$ for its smallest element. Note that if C is a circuit inside $I^{(r)}$ then C is a union of T-parts of $I^{(r)}$, therefore if C does not contain $i^{(r)}$ it must be a circuit inside $I^{(r+1)}$. Finally we set

$$\widehat{I} = I \setminus \{i^{(0)}, \dots, i^{(n)}\}.$$

(c) If I is neither independent nor a T-flat, then by Corollary 10.2 we have a nontrivial decomposition $I = K \oplus J$ where K is the unique maximal T-flat contained in I, and J is independent. In that case we set $\widehat{I} = \widehat{K} \cup \widehat{J}$.

Remark 12.3. It is clear from this construction that $\widehat{I}$ does not contain any circuits, and since $r_I = |\widehat{I}|$ the set $\widehat{I}$ is a maximal independent set in I.

Proof of Theorem 12.1. We assume that both I and A are connected, since otherwise the result is immediate from Theorem 10.5. Let $I_j = I \setminus J_j$, thus the sets $I_1, \dots, I_k$ are the T-parts of I that are disjoint from A. Since $A \in \mathcal{T}_{n-2}$, it is clear that $k \geq 2$. When $n \geq 2$ we set $J = A$, and when $n = 1$ we set $J = I_{k+1}$ where I_{k+1} is the T-part of I that contains the singleton $A = \{a\}$.

We choose a linear order on the set I such that the elements of the set J are the biggest $|J|$ elements of I. Then it is clear that $\hat{J} \subset \hat{I}$. In addition we require that all the elements of $I_i = I \setminus J_i$ are smaller than the elements of I_j for $i < j$, and, when $n = 1$, that a is the smallest element of J. Let i_p be the smallest element of I_p and let $I'_p = I_p \setminus \{i_p\}$, in particular when $n = 1$ we have $a = i_{k+1}$. Thus $i^{(0)} = i_1 = \min\{i_p \mid 1 \leq p \leq k\}$, we set $I' = I \setminus \{i^{(0)}\}$, and, when $n = 1$ we set $J' = J \setminus a$. Also we have $i^{(1)} = i_2$, and clearly

$$\widehat{I} = I'_1 \sqcup I'_2 \sqcup I_3 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup I_k \sqcup \widehat{J}.$$

Similarly, for J_i we have $\widehat{J} \subset \widehat{J_i}$, and

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{J_1} &= I'_2 \sqcup I_3 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup I_k \sqcup \widehat{J}, \\ \widehat{J_2} &= I'_1 \sqcup I_3 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup I_k \sqcup \widehat{J}, \quad \text{and} \\ \widehat{J}_i &= I'_1 \sqcup I_2 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup I_{i-1} \sqcup I_{i+1} \sqcup \cdots \sqcup I_k \sqcup \widehat{J} \quad \text{for } i \geq 3. \end{aligned}$$

Using the linear ordering on I we identify each subset of I with the increasing sequence of its elements. For a sequence $K = (a_1, \dots, a_q)$ we set

$$e_K = e_{a_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge e_{a_q} \in \wedge^q U \quad \text{and} \quad v_K = \phi(e_{a_1}) \wedge \cdots \wedge \phi(e_{a_q}) \in \wedge^q V.$$

If K is a subset of I and the elements $\phi(e_{a_1}), \dots, \phi(e_{a_q})$ form a basis of V_K, we write e_K^* and v_K^* for the unique elements of $\wedge^q U_K^*$ and $\wedge^q V_K^*$ respectively, such that $e_K^*(e_K) = 1$ and $v_K^*(v_K) = 1$. In particular $v_{\hat{I}}$ is a basis of $\wedge^{r_I} V_I$ and $v_{\hat{I}}^*$ is the dual basis of $\wedge^{r_I} V_I^*$. With this notation we also have

$$\begin{aligned}
v_{\widehat{J_1}} &= v_{I_2'} \wedge v_{I_3} \wedge \cdots \wedge v_{I_k} \wedge v_{\hat{J}} \\
v_{\widehat{J_2}} &= v_{I_1'} \wedge v_{I_3} \wedge \cdots \wedge v_{I_k} \wedge v_{\hat{J}} \\
v_{\widehat{J_j}} &= v_{I_1'} \wedge v_{I_2} \wedge \cdots \wedge v_{I_{j-1}} \wedge v_{I_{j+1}} \wedge \cdots \wedge v_{I_k} \wedge v_{\hat{J}} \quad \text{for} \quad 3 \le j \le k
\end{aligned}$$

Next, for $p = 1, \dots, k$ (or $p = 1, \dots, k+1$ when $n = 1$) let

$$u_p = \sum_{i \in I_p} x_i e_i$$

be the unique element of U_{I_p} such that $x_{i_p} = 1$ and $w_p = \phi(u_p) \in V_{I_p} \cap V_{I \smallsetminus I_p}$. Since I is connected for each j we have that the T-part I_j is independent, and

$$v_{I_j} = w_j \wedge v_{I_j'}.$$

Also, for each $j \ge 2$ let

$$v_j = u_1 + \sum_{2 \le i \ne j} \alpha_{ij} u_i$$

be the unique element in $U_{J_j \smallsetminus J}$ such that $y_j = \phi(v_j) \in V_J \cap V_{J_j \smallsetminus J}$ (we know that v_j has to be a unique linear combination of the u_i because of Remarks 9.3, which also imply that we have $\alpha_{ij} \ne 0$ for all $i \ne j$). When $j = 1$ we define analogously v_1, and y_1, and again we have a unique linear combination with non zero coefficients

$$v_1 = u_2 + \sum_{3 \le i} \alpha_{i1} u_i.$$

It follows that $v_{\hat{I}} = v_{I_1'} \wedge v_{\widehat{J_1}}$ and $v_{\hat{I}} = (-1)^{|I_1'||I_2'|} v_{I_2'} \wedge v_{\widehat{J_2}}$, while for $j \ge 3$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
v_{\hat{I}} &= v_{I_1'} \wedge v_{I_2'} \wedge v_{I_3} \wedge \cdots \wedge v_{I_k} \wedge v_{\hat{J}} \\
&= v_{I_1'} \wedge v_{I_2'} \wedge v_{I_3} \wedge \cdots \wedge v_{I_{j-1}} \wedge (w_j \wedge v_{I_j'}) \wedge v_{I_{j+1}} \wedge \cdots \wedge v_{I_k} \wedge v_{\hat{J}} \\
&= v_{I_1'} \wedge v_{I_2'} \wedge v_{I_3} \wedge \cdots \wedge \left(\tfrac{\phi(v_1) - w_2 - \sum_{3 \le i \ne j} \alpha_{i1} w_i}{\alpha_{j1}} \wedge v_{I_j'} \right) \wedge \cdots \wedge v_{I_k} \wedge v_{\hat{J}} \\
&= v_{I_1'} \wedge v_{I_2'} \wedge v_{I_3} \wedge \cdots \wedge v_{I_{j-1}} \wedge \left(\frac{-w_2}{\alpha_{j1}} \wedge v_{I_j'} \right) \wedge v_{I_{j+1}} \wedge \cdots \wedge v_{I_k} \wedge v_{\hat{J}} \\
&= \left(\tfrac{(-1)^{|I_2| + \cdots + |I_{j-1}|}}{\alpha_{j1}} \right) v_{I_1'} \wedge (w_2 \wedge v_{I_2'}) \wedge v_{I_3} \wedge \cdots \wedge v_{I_j'} \wedge \cdots \wedge v_{I_k} \wedge v_{\hat{J}} \\
&= \left(\tfrac{(-1)^{|I_2| + \cdots + |I_{j-1}|}}{\alpha_{j1}} \right) v_{I_1'} \wedge v_{I_2} \wedge v_{I_3} \wedge \cdots \wedge v_{I_{j-1}} \wedge v_{I_j'} \wedge v_{I_{j+1}} \wedge \cdots \wedge v_{I_k} \wedge v_{\hat{J}} \\
&= \left(\tfrac{(-1)^{|I_j| (\sum_{i=2}^{j-1} |I_i|) + |I_j'||I_1'|}}{\alpha_{j1}} \right) v_{I_j'} \wedge v_{I_1'} \wedge v_{I_2} \wedge \cdots \wedge v_{I_{j-1}} \wedge v_{I_{j+1}} \wedge \cdots \wedge v_{I_k} \wedge v_{\hat{J}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore for $3 \leq j \leq k$ we obtain the formula

$$v_{\widehat{I}} = (-1)^{\tau_j} \frac{1}{\alpha_{j1}}\, v_{I'_j} \wedge v_{\widehat{J_j}}. \tag{12.4}$$

where $\tau_j = 1 + |I_1| + |I_j|(1 + \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} |I_i|)$.

In order to prove the Theorem it is enough to show that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k} (-1)^{|J_j|} (\phi_n^{I,J_j})^* \circ (\phi_{n-1}^{J_j,A})^* = 0,$$

and for the rest of this argument we will concentrate on proving this equality. Also, despite their similarity there are enough distinctions that unfortunately force us to treat the cases $n \geq 2$ and $n = 1$ separately.

Case $n \geq 2$. In this case A is a connected T-flat. Furthermore, if J_j is not connected, then (since we are assuming that $J = A$ is connected) Proposition 10.4 implies that $J_j \smallsetminus J$ must be a circuit, and we must have $y_j = 0$. When J_j is connected we get

$$v_{J_j \smallsetminus J} = \begin{cases} y_1 \wedge v_{I'_2} \wedge v_{I_3} \wedge \cdots \wedge v_{I_k} & \text{if } j = 1; \\ y_2 \wedge v_{I'_1} \wedge v_{I_3} \wedge \cdots \wedge v_{I_k} & \text{if } j = 2; \\ y_j \wedge v_{I'_1} \wedge v_{I_2} \wedge \cdots \wedge v_{I_{j-1}} \wedge v_{I_{j+1}} \wedge \cdots \wedge v_{I_k} & \text{if } j \geq 3. \end{cases} \tag{12.5}$$

Let us take an arbitrary element z in $T_J(\phi)^* = S_J(\phi) \otimes \wedge^{|J|} U_J^* \otimes \wedge^{r_J} V_J$. Thus z has the form $z = x \otimes e_J^* \otimes v_{\widehat{J}}$ for some $x \in S_J(\phi)$. Computing the image t_j of z in $T_{J_j}(\phi)^*$ we obtain

$$t_j = (\phi_{n-1}^{J_j,J})^*(z) = y_j x \otimes e_{J_j}^* \otimes v_{\widehat{J_j}}.$$

Indeed, this is trivially true when J_j is not connected since then $y_j = 0$. When J_j is connected, this follows from (12.5) in view of the definition of y_j, the definition of $\phi_{n-1}^{J_j J}$, and the fact that the map $\overset{\circ}{\wedge} V_{J_j \smallsetminus J}^* \longrightarrow \overset{\circ}{\wedge} U_{J_j \smallsetminus J}^*$ induced by ϕ^* sends $v_{J_j \smallsetminus J}^*$ to $e_{J_j \smallsetminus J}^*$. Similarly, computing the image of t_j in $T_I(\phi)^*$ for $j \geq 3$ we obtain

$$(\phi_n^{IJ_j})^*(t_j) = (-1)^{\delta_j} \alpha_{j1} w_j y_j x \otimes e_I^* \otimes v_{\widehat{I}}$$

where $\delta_j = \tau_j + |I_j| \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} |I_i|$, and therefore $(-1)^{\delta_j} = (-1)^{1+|I_1|+|I_j|}$. For the remaining possibilities $j = 1$ and $j = 2$ we obtain

$$(\phi_n^{IJ_j})^*(t_j) = \begin{cases} w_1 y_1 \otimes e_I^* \otimes v_{\widehat{I}} & \text{if } j = 1; \\ (-1)^{1+|I_1|+|I_2|} w_2 y_2 \otimes e_I^* \otimes v_{\widehat{I}} & \text{if } j = 2. \end{cases}$$

In particular, this yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j=1}^{k} (-1)^{|J_j|} (\phi_n^{IJ_j})^*(t_j) \\ &= \left((-1)^{|J_1|} w_1 y_1 x - (-1)^{|I_1|+|I|} w_2 y_2 x - \sum_{j=3}^{k} (-1)^{|I_1|+|I|} \alpha_{j1} w_j y_j x \right) \otimes e_I^* \otimes v_{\widehat{I}} \\ &= (-1)^{|I|+|I_1|} \left(w_1 y_1 x - w_2 y_2 x - \sum_{j=3}^{k} \alpha_{j1} w_j y_j x \right) \otimes e_I^* \otimes v_{\widehat{I}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus to complete our proof of the case $n \geq 2$, it suffices to show that the expression

$$Z = w_1 y_1 - w_2 y_2 - \sum_{j=3}^{k} \alpha_{j1} w_j y_j \tag{12.6}$$

is equal to zero in the symmetric algebra of the space W. Since $w_1 y_1 = w_2 w_1 + \sum_{i=3}^{k} \alpha_{i1} w_i w_1$ and $w_2 y_2 = w_1 w_2 + \sum_{i=3}^{k} \alpha_{i2} w_i w_2$, while for $j \geq 3$ we have $w_j y_j = w_1 w_j + \sum_{2 \leq i \neq j} \alpha_{ij} w_i w_j$, we obtain

$$Z = -\sum_{j=3}^{k} (\alpha_{j2} + \alpha_{j1}\alpha_{2j}) w_j w_2 - \sum_{j=3}^{k-1} \sum_{i=j+1}^{k} (\alpha_{j1}\alpha_{ij} + \alpha_{i1}\alpha_{ji}) w_i w_j .$$

Let U' be the subspace of $U_{I \smallsetminus J}$ spanned by the (independent) vectors $u_1, \ldots, u_k$. Note that by Remark 9.3(d) a vector in $U_{I \smallsetminus J}$ gets mapped under ϕ inside V_J only if that vector belongs to the subspace U', in particular $K' = \ker \phi \cap U_{I \smallsetminus J}$ is a subspace of U'. Let $V' = \phi(U')$. Thus $V_{I \smallsetminus J} \cap V_J = V' \cap V_J$, and (since the level of J is $n-2$) we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\dim V' \cap V_J &= \dim V_{I \smallsetminus J} + \dim V_J - \dim V_I \\
&= r_{I \smallsetminus J} + (|J| - (n-2) - 1) - (|I| - n - 1) \\
&= r_{I \smallsetminus J} - |I \smallsetminus J| - n + 2 - 1 + n + 1 \\
&= r_{I \smallsetminus J} - |I \smallsetminus J| + 2 \\
&= 2 - \dim K'
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore the kernel of the induced by ϕ map $U' \longrightarrow W/V_J$ is exactly 2-dimensional. On the other hand, each of the vectors $v_1, \ldots, v_k$ belong to that kernel. It follows that the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix}
0 & 1 & 1 & \ldots & 1 & \ldots & 1 & \ldots & 1 \\
1 & 0 & \alpha_{23} & \ldots & \alpha_{2j} & \ldots & \alpha_{2i} & \ldots & \alpha_{2k} \\
\alpha_{31} & \alpha_{32} & 0 & \ldots & & \ldots & & \ldots & \alpha_{3k} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\
\alpha_{j1} & \alpha_{j2} & & \ldots & 0 & \ldots & \alpha_{ji} & \ldots & \\
\vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\
\alpha_{i1} & \ldots & & \ldots & \alpha_{ij} & \ldots & 0 & \ldots & \\
\vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots & & \alpha_{k-1,k} \\
\alpha_{k1} & \alpha_{k2} & & \ldots & & \ldots & & \alpha_{k,k-1} & 0
\end{pmatrix}$$

has rank at most two, hence all minors of size 3 are zero. Since the minor on rows $1, 2, j$ and columns $1, 2, j$ is precisely the coefficient of $w_j w_2$ in Z, and since the minor on rows $1, j, i$ and columns $1, j, i$ is precisely the coefficient of $w_i w_j$ in Z, the desired conclusion is immediate.

Case $n = 1$. In this case $J = I_{k+1}$ is the independent T-part of the connected T-flat I of level 1 that contains the singleton $A = \{a\}$. Furthermore, since each J_j is a circuit, there is a unique $\alpha_j \in \Bbbk$ such that $y_j = \alpha_j w_{k+1}$. Since we have

$v_J = w_{k+1} \wedge v_{J'}$, we obtain

$$v_{J_j \smallsetminus a} = \begin{cases} y_1 \wedge v_{I'_2} \wedge v_{I_3} \wedge \cdots \wedge v_{I_k} \wedge v_{J'} & \text{if } j = 1; \\ y_2 \wedge v_{I'_1} \wedge v_{I_3} \wedge \cdots \wedge v_{I_k} \wedge v_{J'} & \text{if } j = 2; \\ y_j \wedge v_{I'_1} \wedge v_{I_2} \wedge \cdots \wedge v_{I_{j-1}} \wedge v_{I_{j+1}} \wedge \cdots \wedge v_{I_k} \wedge v_{J'} & \text{if } 3 \leq j \end{cases} \tag{12.7}$$
$$= (-1)^{|J_j|-|J|-1} \alpha_j v_{\widehat{J_j}}$$

In order to complete the proof of the theorem it is enough to show that

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k} (-1)^{|J_j|} [(\phi_1^{I,J_j})^* \circ (\phi_0^{J_j,a})^*](e_a^*) = 0.$$

Computing the image t_j of e_a^* in $T_{J_j}(\phi)^* = \overset{\circ}{\wedge} U_{J_j}^* \otimes \overset{\circ}{\wedge} V_{J_j}$ we obtain

$$t_j = (\phi_0^{J_j,a})^*(e_a^*) = -\alpha_j (e_{J_j}^* \otimes v_{\widehat{J_j}}).$$

Indeed, this follows from (12.7) in view of the definition of $\phi_0^{J_j,a}$, and the fact that the isomorphism induced by ϕ^*

$$\overset{\circ}{\wedge} V_{J_j \smallsetminus a}^* \otimes U_a^* \longrightarrow \overset{\circ}{\wedge} U_{J_j \smallsetminus a}^* \otimes U_a^* \xrightarrow{\tau} U_a^* \otimes \overset{\circ}{\wedge} U_{J_j \smallsetminus a}^* \longrightarrow \overset{\circ}{\wedge} U_{J_j}^*$$

sends $v_{J_j \smallsetminus a}^* \otimes e_a^*$ to the element $e_a^* \wedge \psi \in \overset{\circ}{\wedge} U_{J_j}^*$ where $\psi \in \wedge^{|J_j|-1} U_{J_j}^*$ is an element such that $\psi(e_{J_j \smallsetminus a}) = 1$ (which implies

$$[e_a^* \wedge \psi](e_{J_j}) = (-1)^{|J_j|-|J|} [e_a^* \wedge \psi](e_a \wedge e_{J_j \smallsetminus a}) = (-1)^{|J_j|-|J|}$$

and therefore $e_a^* \wedge \psi = (-1)^{|J_j|-|J|} e_{J_j}^*$).

Computing the image of t_j in $T_I(\phi)^*$ for $j \geq 3$ we obtain as in the Case $n \geq 2$ that

$$(\phi_1^{IJ_j})^*(t_j) = (-1)^{\delta_j} \alpha_{j1} \alpha_j w_j \otimes e_I^* \otimes v_{\widehat{I}}$$

where $\delta_j = \tau_j + 1 + |I_j| \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} |I_i|$, and therefore $(-1)^{\delta_j} = (-1)^{|I_1|+|I_j|}$. For the remaining possibilities $j = 1$ and $j = 2$ we obtain

$$(\phi_1^{IJ_j})^*(t_j) = \begin{cases} -\alpha_1 w_1 \otimes e_I^* \otimes v_{\widehat{I}} & \text{if } j = 1; \\ (-1)^{|I_1|+|I_2|} \alpha_2 w_2 \otimes e_I^* \otimes v_{\widehat{I}} & \text{if } j = 2. \end{cases}$$

In particular, this yields

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{j=1}^{k} (-1)^{|J_j|} (\phi_1^{IJ_j})^*(t_j) \\ &= \left(-(-1)^{|J_1|} \alpha_1 w_1 + (-1)^{|I_1|+|I|} \alpha_2 w_2 + \sum_{j=3}^{k} (-1)^{|I_1|+|I|} \alpha_{j1} \alpha_j w_j \right) \otimes e_I^* \otimes v_{\widehat{I}} \\ &= (-1)^{|I|+|I_1|+1} \left(\alpha_1 w_1 - \alpha_2 w_2 - \sum_{j=3}^{k} \alpha_{j1} \alpha_j w_j \right) \otimes e_I^* \otimes v_{\widehat{I}}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus to complete our proof, it suffices to show that the vector

$$Z = \alpha_1 w_1 - \alpha_2 w_2 - \sum_{j=3}^{k} \alpha_{j1} \alpha_j w_j \tag{12.8}$$

is equal to zero in the space W.

Let U' be the subspace of U_I spanned by the (independent) vectors $u_1, \dots, u_k, u$. Note that by Remark 9.3(d) a vector in U_I gets mapped to 0 under ϕ only if that vector belongs to the subspace U', in particular $K' = \ker\phi \cap U_I$ is a subspace of U'. Since I has level 1, we have $\dim K' = |I| - r_I = 2$. Furthermore, the vectors $v_1 - \alpha_1 u, \dots, v_k - \alpha_k u$ belong to K', and the first two are clearly independent hence form a basis for K'. It follows that the matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 1 & \dots & 1 & \dots & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & \alpha_{23} & \dots & \alpha_{2j} & \dots & \alpha_{2k} \\ \alpha_{31} & \alpha_{32} & 0 & \dots & \alpha_{3j} & \dots & \alpha_{3k} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \alpha_{j1} & \alpha_{j2} & \alpha_{j3} & \dots & 0 & \dots & \alpha_{jk} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & & \vdots \\ \alpha_{k1} & \alpha_{k2} & \alpha_{k3} & \dots & \alpha_{kj} & \dots & 0 \\ -\alpha_1 & -\alpha_2 & -\alpha_3 & \dots & -\alpha_j & \dots & -\alpha_k \end{pmatrix}$$

has rank exactly two, hence all minors of size 3 are zero. In particular, the minor on rows $1, j, k+1$ and columns $1, 2, j$ is zero, which yields that for each $j \geq 3$ we have

$$\alpha_{j1}\alpha_j = \alpha_{j1}\alpha_2 - \alpha_{j2}\alpha_1.$$

Therefore we get

$$Z = \alpha_1 \left(-\alpha_2 w + w_1 + \sum_{j=3}^{k} \alpha_{j2} w_j \right) - \alpha_2 \left(-\alpha_1 w + w_2 + \sum_{j=3}^{k} \alpha_{j1} w_j \right).$$

The desired conclusion is now immediate since $-\alpha_2 w + w_1 + \sum_{j=3}^{k} \alpha_{j2} w_j = \phi(v_2 - \alpha_2 u) = 0$ and similarly $-\alpha_1 w + w_2 + \sum_{j=3}^{k} \alpha_{j1} w_j = \phi(v_1 - \alpha_1 u) = 0$. □

Now we can give the proof of Theorem 6.1, in this way completing also the proofs of Theorem 6.2 and Theorem 6.3.

Proof of Theorem 6.1. Assume first that $n \geq 1$. We need to show that if $z \in T_I$ for some connected T-flat I of level n then $[\phi_{n-1} \circ \phi_n](z) = 0$. Thus it is enough to show that the component of $[\phi_{n-1} \circ \phi_n](z)$ in T_A is zero for every $A \in \mathcal{T}_{n-2}(\mathbf{M})$. By the definitions of ϕ_n and ϕ_{n-1} it is clear that this component is zero when A is not a subset of I; and when A is a subset of I this component is precisely

$$(-1)^{|A|} \sum_{i=1}^{k} (-1)^{|J_i|} [\phi_{n-1}^{J_i, A} \circ \phi_n^{I, J_i}](z)$$

where we use the same notation as in Theorem 12.1, hence is zero by that theorem.

It remains to show that $\phi_{-1} \circ \phi_0 = 0$. However, when I is a circuit the map $\phi|I$ represents a uniform matroid and therefore the sequence $T_\bullet(\phi|I)^+$ is a complex, see Example 5.7. Since by Theorem 11.1 the sequence $T_\bullet(\phi|I)^+$ is the same as the sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow T_I(\phi) \xrightarrow{\phi_0} U_I \xrightarrow{\phi_{-1}} W \longrightarrow 0,$$

we obtain that $(\phi_{-1} \circ \phi_0)\big|_{T_I} = 0$. It is now immediate that $\phi_{-1} \circ \phi_0 = 0$. □

13. The definition of $(\pi.Y)^{\phi}_{\bullet}\colon\ T_\bullet(\phi.Y) \longrightarrow T_\bullet(\phi)$

In this section $\phi\colon\ U_S \longrightarrow W$ is a representation over $\Bbbk$ of a matroid $\mathbf{M}$ on a finite set S, the set Y is a subset of S such that $S \smallsetminus Y$ is independent, and $\pi^{\phi}_{Y} = \pi\colon\ W \longrightarrow \overline{W} = W/V_{S\smallsetminus Y}(\phi)$ is the canonical projection.

Our main goal is to present the definition and some basic properties of the morphism of complexes

$$(\pi.Y)^{\phi}_{\bullet}\colon\ T_\bullet(\phi.Y) \longrightarrow T_\bullet(\phi)$$

mentioned in the statement of Theorem 6.4. We will use these in Section 15 for the proofs of both Theorem 6.4 and Theorem 6.5. We begin by introducing some notation.

Definition 13.1. Let A be a T-flat of $\mathbf{M}.Y$, and let $B = S \smallsetminus (Y \smallsetminus A)^{\mathsf{C}_{\mathbf{M}^*}}$.

(a) By repeatedly using Corollary 8.4 and contracting one element at a time, it is clear that one always has an equality $r^{\mathbf{M}}_{B\smallsetminus A} + r^{\mathbf{M}.Y}_{A} = r^{\mathbf{M}}_{B}$ and an exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow V_{B\smallsetminus A}(\phi) \longrightarrow V_B(\phi) \longrightarrow V_A(\phi.Y) \longrightarrow 0. \tag{13.2}$$

(b) Since $S \smallsetminus Y$ is independent, $r^{\mathbf{M}}_{B\smallsetminus A} = |B \smallsetminus A|$ and we have canonical isomorphisms

$$\mathbf{c}^{\phi}_{Y,A} = \mathbf{c}^{\phi}_{Y} = \mathbf{c}\colon\ \ \mathring{\textstyle\bigwedge} V_A(\phi.Y)^* \otimes \mathring{\textstyle\bigwedge} V_{B\smallsetminus A}(\phi)^* \ \longrightarrow\ \mathring{\textstyle\bigwedge} V_B(\phi)^*$$

and

$$\mathbf{d}^{\phi}_{Y,A} = \mathbf{d}^{\phi}_{Y} = \mathbf{d}\colon\ \ \Bbbk \ \longrightarrow\ \mathring{\textstyle\bigwedge} U_{B\smallsetminus A} \otimes \mathring{\textstyle\bigwedge} V_{B\smallsetminus A}(\phi)^*$$

induced by the canonical projection $\pi\colon\ W \longrightarrow \overline{W}$ and by the map ϕ, respectively.

We are now ready to proceed with the definition of the canonical morphism of complexes $(\pi.Y)^{\phi}_{\bullet}\colon\ T_\bullet(\phi.Y) \longrightarrow T_\bullet(\phi)$.

Definition 13.3. (a) Let A be a T-flat of $\mathbf{M}.Y$, and let $B = S \smallsetminus (Y \smallsetminus A)^{\mathsf{C}_{\mathbf{M}^*}}$. We define a canonical inclusion homomorphism

$$(\pi.Y)^{\phi}_{A}\colon\ T_A(\phi.Y) \longrightarrow T_B(\phi)$$

as the composition

$$T_A(\phi.Y) \xrightarrow{\ 1\otimes\mathbf{d}\ } T^{(1)}_{AB} \xrightarrow{\ \tau\ } T^{(2)}_{AB} \xrightarrow{\ \pi^*_{Y,A}\otimes\wedge\otimes\mathbf{c}\ } T_B(\phi), \tag{13.4}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} T^{(1)}_{AB} &= T_A(\phi.Y) \otimes \mathring{\textstyle\bigwedge} U_{B\smallsetminus A} \otimes \mathring{\textstyle\bigwedge} V_{B\smallsetminus A}(\phi)^*, \\ &= S_A(\phi.Y)^* \otimes \mathring{\textstyle\bigwedge} U_A \otimes \mathring{\textstyle\bigwedge} V_A(\phi.Y)^* \otimes \mathring{\textstyle\bigwedge} U_{B\smallsetminus A} \otimes \mathring{\textstyle\bigwedge} V_{B\smallsetminus A}(\phi)^*, \\ T^{(2)}_{AB} &= S_A(\phi.Y)^* \otimes \mathring{\textstyle\bigwedge} U_A \otimes \mathring{\textstyle\bigwedge} U_{B\smallsetminus A} \otimes \mathring{\textstyle\bigwedge} V_A(\phi.Y)^* \otimes \mathring{\textstyle\bigwedge} V_{B\smallsetminus A}(\phi)^*, \end{aligned} \tag{13.5}$$

and the map τ is, as usual, the canonical isomorphism that simply rearranges the components of the tensor product in the indicated order.

(b) For each $n \geq 0$ we define a canonical injective homomorphism

$$(\pi.Y)^{\phi}_{n}\colon\ T_n(\phi.Y) \longrightarrow T_n(\phi)$$

by the requirement that it restricts to the component $T_A(\phi.Y)$ of $T_n(\phi.Y)$ as

$$(\pi.Y)^{\phi}_{n}\big|_{T_A(\phi.Y)} = (-1)^{n|B\smallsetminus A|}(\pi.Y)^{\phi}_{A}$$

for every T-flat A in $\mathbf{M}.Y$ of level n.

(c) We write $(\pi.Y)^{\phi}_{\bullet}$ for the sequence of homomorphisms $\{(\pi.Y)^{\phi}_{n}\}_{n\geq 0}$. When ϕ is clear from context we omit superscripts and write $(\pi.Y)_A$, $(\pi.Y)_n$, and $(\pi.Y)_{\bullet}$.

The main results in this section are the following two theorems.

Theorem 13.6. *Let Y be such that $S\smallsetminus Y$ is independent in $\mathbf{M}$, and let $Y\subseteq Y_1$. Let A be a T-flat in $\mathbf{M}.Y$, let $B=S\smallsetminus (Y\smallsetminus A)^{\complement_{\mathbf{M}^*}}$, and let $A_1=B\cap Y_1$. Then*

$$(\pi.Y)^{\phi}_{A}=(\pi.Y_1)^{\phi}_{A_1}\circ(\pi.Y)^{\phi.Y_1}_{A}.$$

Furthermore, $(\pi.Y)^{\phi}_{\bullet}=(\pi.Y_1)^{\phi}_{\bullet}\circ(\pi.Y)^{\phi.Y_1}_{\bullet}$.

Theorem 13.7. *Let Y be a subset of S such that $S\smallsetminus Y$ is independent in $\mathbf{M}$. Then $(\pi.Y)^{\phi}_{\bullet}$ is an injective morphism of complexes from $T_{\bullet}(\phi.Y)$ into $T_{\bullet}(\phi)$.*

The proof of Theorem 13.7 is involved, and we present it in the next section. We conclude this section with the proof of Theorem 13.6.

Proof of Theorem 13.6. The second assertion of the theorem is an immediate consequence of the first, and we proceed with the proof of that first assertion.

Since $S\smallsetminus Y$ is independent, we have that B and A_1 are T-flats of level n in $\mathbf{M}$ and $\mathbf{M}.Y_1$, respectively. For the same reason the sets $A_1\smallsetminus A$ and $B\smallsetminus A$ are independent in $\mathbf{M}.Y_1$ and $\mathbf{M}$ respectively. Therefore $B\smallsetminus A_1$ is also independent in $\mathbf{M}$ and we have a canonical exact sequence of $\Bbbk$-vector spaces

$$0\longrightarrow V_{B\smallsetminus A_1}(\phi)\xrightarrow{\ \subseteq\ }V_{B\smallsetminus A}(\phi)\xrightarrow{\ \pi^{\phi}_{Y_1}\ }V_{A_1\smallsetminus A}(\phi.Y_1)\longrightarrow 0$$

which induces an isomorphism

$$\mathbf{e}\colon\ \mathring{\bigwedge} V_{A_1\smallsetminus A}(\phi.Y_1)^*\otimes\mathring{\bigwedge} V_{B\smallsetminus A_1}(\phi)^*\longrightarrow\mathring{\bigwedge} V_{B\smallsetminus A}(\phi)^*.$$

To make our commutative diagrams more compact, for the rest of this proof we use the following notation: given subsets $X, X_1,\dots,X_t$ we set $\overline{\overline{V}}_X=V_X(\phi.Y)$ and $\overline{V}_X=V_X(\phi.Y_1)$, as well as $\mathring{\bigwedge} U_{X_1,\dots,X_t}=\mathring{\bigwedge} U_{X_1}\otimes\cdots\otimes\mathring{\bigwedge} U_{X_t}$. Using the associativity of the wedge product and the definitions of the maps $\mathbf{c}$, $\mathbf{d}$, and $\mathbf{e}$, it is now straightforward to verify that the diagrams

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathring{\bigwedge}\overline{\overline{V}}^*_A\otimes\mathring{\bigwedge}\overline{V}^*_{A_1\smallsetminus A}\otimes\mathring{\bigwedge} V^*_{B\smallsetminus A_1} \arrow[r, "1\otimes\mathbf{e}"] \arrow[d, "\mathbf{c}^{\phi.Y_1}_{Y}\otimes 1"'] & \mathring{\bigwedge}\overline{\overline{V}}^*_A\otimes\mathring{\bigwedge} V^*_{B\smallsetminus A} \arrow[d, "\mathbf{c}^{\phi}_{Y}"] \\
\mathring{\bigwedge}\overline{V}^*_{A_1}\otimes\mathring{\bigwedge} V^*_{B\smallsetminus A_1} \arrow[r, "\mathbf{c}^{\phi}_{Y_1}"] & \mathring{\bigwedge} V^*_B
\end{tikzcd}$$

and

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathring{\bigwedge} U_{A,A_1\smallsetminus A,B\smallsetminus A_1} \arrow[r, "1\otimes\wedge"] \arrow[d, "\wedge\otimes 1"'] & \mathring{\bigwedge} U_{A,B\smallsetminus A} \arrow[d, "\wedge"] \\
\mathring{\bigwedge} U_{A_1,B\smallsetminus A_1} \arrow[r, "\wedge"] & \mathring{\bigwedge} U_B
\end{tikzcd}$$

together with

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\Bbbk \arrow[r, "\tau\ \circ\ \left(\mathbf{d}^{\phi.Y_1}_{Y,A}\otimes\mathbf{d}^{\phi}_{Y_1,A_1}\right)"] \arrow[d, "="'] & \mathring{\bigwedge} U_{A_1\smallsetminus A,B\smallsetminus A_1}\otimes\mathring{\bigwedge}\overline{V}^*_{A_1\smallsetminus A}\otimes\mathring{\bigwedge} V^*_{B\smallsetminus A_1} \arrow[d, "\wedge\otimes\mathbf{e}"] \\
\Bbbk \arrow[r, "\mathbf{d}^{\phi}_{Y}"] & \mathring{\bigwedge} U_{B\smallsetminus A}\otimes\mathring{\bigwedge} V^*_{B\smallsetminus A}
\end{tikzcd}$$

are commutative. It follows that the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathring{\bigwedge} U_A \otimes \overline{\overline{V}}^*_A \arrow[r, "="] \arrow[d, "\tau\circ(1\otimes\mathbf{d})"'] & \mathring{\bigwedge} U_A \otimes \overline{\overline{V}}^*_A \arrow[r, "="] \arrow[d, "\tau\circ(1\otimes\mathbf{d}\otimes\mathbf{d})"'] & \mathring{\bigwedge} U_A \otimes \overline{\overline{V}}^*_A \arrow[d, "\tau\circ(1\otimes\mathbf{d})"'] \\
\mathring{\bigwedge} U_{A,A_1\smallsetminus A} \otimes \widetilde{V}_3 \arrow[r, "\tau\circ(1\otimes\mathbf{d})"] \arrow[d, "\wedge\otimes\mathbf{c}"'] & \mathring{\bigwedge} U_{A,A_1\smallsetminus A,B\smallsetminus A_1} \otimes \widetilde{V} \arrow[r, "1\otimes\wedge\otimes 1\otimes\mathbf{e}"] \arrow[d, "\wedge\otimes 1\otimes\mathbf{c}\otimes 1"'] & \mathring{\bigwedge} U_{A,B\smallsetminus A} \otimes \widetilde{V}_1 \arrow[d, "\wedge\otimes\mathbf{c}"'] \\
\mathring{\bigwedge} U_{A_1} \otimes \mathring{\bigwedge} \overline{V}^*_{A_1} \arrow[r, "\tau\circ(1\otimes\mathbf{d})"] & \mathring{\bigwedge} U_{A_1,B\smallsetminus A_1} \otimes \widetilde{V}_2 \arrow[r, "\wedge\otimes\mathbf{c}"] & \mathring{\bigwedge} U_B \otimes \mathring{\bigwedge} V^*_B
\end{tikzcd}$$

is also commutative, where

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{V} &= \mathring{\bigwedge} \overline{\overline{V}}^*_A \otimes \mathring{\bigwedge} \overline{V}^*_{A_1\smallsetminus A} \otimes \mathring{\bigwedge} V^*_{B\smallsetminus A_1}\\
\widetilde{V}_1 &= \mathring{\bigwedge} \overline{\overline{V}}^*_A \otimes \mathring{\bigwedge} V^*_{B\smallsetminus A}\\
\widetilde{V}_2 &= \mathring{\bigwedge} \overline{V}^*_{A_1} \otimes \mathring{\bigwedge} V^*_{B\smallsetminus A_1}\\
\widetilde{V}_3 &= \mathring{\bigwedge} \overline{\overline{V}}^*_A \otimes \mathring{\bigwedge} \overline{V}^*_{A_1\smallsetminus A}.
\end{aligned}$$

The desired conclusion now follows from Remark 11.3 and Definition 13.3. □

14. $(\pi.Y)^{\phi}_{\bullet}$ IS A MORPHISM OF COMPLEXES

In this section $\phi\colon\ U_S \longrightarrow W$ is a representation over $\Bbbk$ of a matroid $\mathbf{M}$ on a finite set S. Our goal is to present the proof of Theorem 13.7. The following result is a key ingredient.

Theorem 14.1. *Let $a \in S$ be such that $\{a\}$ is independent in $\mathbf{M}$. Let A be a T-flat in $\mathbf{M}.S_a$ of level $n \geq 1$, let A' be a maximal proper T-flat of $\mathbf{M}.S_a$, let $B = S \smallsetminus (S_a \smallsetminus A)^{\complement_{\mathbf{M}^*}}$, and let $B' = S \smallsetminus (S_a \smallsetminus A')^{\complement_{\mathbf{M}^*}}$. Then*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
T_A(\phi.S_a) \arrow[r, "(-1)^{|A'|}(\phi.S_a)^{AA'}_n"] \arrow[d, "(-1)^{n|B\smallsetminus A|}(\pi.S_a)_A"'] & T_{A'}(\phi.S_a) \arrow[d, "(-1)^{(n-1)|B'\smallsetminus A'|}(\pi.S_a)_{A'}"] \\
T_B(\phi) \arrow[r, "(-1)^{|B'|}\phi^{BB'}_n"] & T_{B'}(\phi)
\end{tikzcd} \tag{14.2}$$

is a commutative diagram.

Proof. Throughout this proof we use the following notation: for $X \subseteq S_a$ we set $\overline{r}_X = r^{\mathbf{M}.S_a}_X$ and $\overline{V}_X = V_X(\phi.S_a)$, as well as $\overline{T}_X = T_X(\phi.S_a)$. By Theorem 8.3 the set B' is a maximal proper T-flat of $\mathbf{M}$ inside B and as in (13.2) we have an equality $r_{B'\smallsetminus A'} + \overline{r}_{A'} = r_{B'}$ and an exact sequence.

$$0 \longrightarrow V_{B'\smallsetminus A'} \longrightarrow V_{B'} \longrightarrow \overline{V}_{A'} \longrightarrow 0.$$

Since $B' \smallsetminus A' \subseteq B \smallsetminus A$, if $B = A$ then $B' = A'$ and it is straightforward to verify from the definitions that the diagram (14.2) is commutative. Our next goal is to show that this diagram commutes also in the remaining case $B = A \cup \{a\}$. This is obvious if $\overline{T}_A = 0$, therefore until stated otherwise, in the sequel we will always assume that $B = A \cup \{a\}$ and that the T-flat A is connected in $\mathbf{M}.S_a$.

Now we look at the following commutative diagram with exact rows:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
0 \arrow[r] & V_{B'\smallsetminus A'} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & V_{B'} \arrow[r, "\pi"] \arrow[d] & \overline{V}_{A'} \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & 0 \\
0 \arrow[r] & V_{B\smallsetminus A} \arrow[r] & V_B \arrow[r, "\pi"] & \overline{V}_A \arrow[r] & 0.
\end{tikzcd}$$

In it all the vertical maps are canonical inclusions. Furthermore, the cokernel of the middle one is precisely $K_{BB'}$, and we write $\overline{K}_{AA'} = \overline{V}_A/\overline{V}_{A'}$ for the cokernel of the inclusion to the right. Thus π induces a canonical map $\overline{\pi}\colon\ K_{BB'} \longrightarrow \overline{K}_{AA'}$. Also, since we are assuming $B = A\cup\{a\}$, we have $V_{B\smallsetminus A} = V_a$. Since either $B' = A'$ or $B' = A'\cup\{a\}$, we treat these two cases separately.

Assume first that $B' = A'\cup\{a\}$. Then we have the canonical isomorphisms $\overline{\pi}$ and

$$\mathbf{c}'\colon\ \mathring{\bigwedge}\overline{V}^*_{A'}\otimes V_a^* \longrightarrow \mathring{\bigwedge} V^*_{B'},$$

and an equality $B\smallsetminus B' = A\smallsetminus A'$. Furthermore, since A is connected the T-part $A\smallsetminus A'$ is independent in $\mathbf{M}.S_a$, therefore the map π induces an isomorphism from $V_{B\smallsetminus B'}$ to $\overline{V}_{A\smallsetminus A'}$. We write π' for the canonically induced inverse isomorphism

$$\pi'\colon\ \mathring{\bigwedge}\overline{V}_{A\smallsetminus A'} \longrightarrow \mathring{\bigwedge} V_{B\smallsetminus B'}.$$

It is now routine to check that the canonically induced diagrams

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathring{\bigwedge}\overline{V}^*_A\otimes V_a^* \arrow[r, "\mathbf{c}"] \arrow[d, "\bar{\mathbf{a}}\,\otimes 1"'] & \mathring{\bigwedge} V_B^* \arrow[d, "\mathbf{a}"] \\
\mathring{\bigwedge}\overline{K}^*_{AA'}\otimes\mathring{\bigwedge}\overline{V}^*_{A'}\otimes V_a^* \arrow[r, "\wedge\overline{\pi}^*\otimes\mathbf{c}'"] & \mathring{\bigwedge} K^*_{BB'}\otimes\mathring{\bigwedge}\overline{V}^*_{B'}
\end{tikzcd} \tag{14.3}$$

and

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathring{\bigwedge} U_A\otimes U_a \arrow[r, "\wedge"] \arrow[d, "\delta\otimes 1"'] & \mathring{\bigwedge} U_B \arrow[d, "\delta"] \\
\mathring{\bigwedge} U_{A\smallsetminus A'}\otimes\mathring{\bigwedge} U_{A'}\otimes U_a \arrow[r, "1\otimes\wedge"] & \mathring{\bigwedge} U_{B\smallsetminus B'}\otimes\mathring{\bigwedge} U_{B'}
\end{tikzcd} \tag{14.4}$$

together with

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(\overline{V}_{A'}\cap\overline{V}_{A\smallsetminus A'})^*\otimes\mathring{\bigwedge}\overline{K}^*_{AA'} \arrow[r, "\pi^*\otimes\wedge\overline{\pi}^*"] \arrow[d, "\bar{\mathbf{b}}"'] & (V_{B'}\cap V_{B\smallsetminus B'})^*\otimes\mathring{\bigwedge} K^*_{BB'} \arrow[d, "\mathbf{b}"] \\
\mathring{\bigwedge}\overline{V}^*_{A\smallsetminus A'} \arrow[r, "\wedge\pi^*"] & \mathring{\bigwedge} V^*_{B\smallsetminus B'}
\end{tikzcd} \tag{14.5}$$

and

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathring{\bigwedge}\overline{V}^*_{A\smallsetminus A'}\otimes\mathring{\bigwedge}\overline{V}_{A\smallsetminus A'} \arrow[r, "\wedge\pi^*\otimes\wedge\pi'"] \arrow[d, "\mu\otimes 1"'] & \mathring{\bigwedge} V^*_{B\smallsetminus B'}\otimes\mathring{\bigwedge} V_{B\smallsetminus B'} \arrow[d, "\mu\otimes 1"] \\
\Bbbk \arrow[r, "="] & \Bbbk
\end{tikzcd} \tag{14.6}$$

are commutative. Write $\overline{S}_A$ and $\overline{S}_{A'}$ for for $S_A(\phi.S_a)$ and $S_{A'}(\phi.S_a)$, respectively. Since the maps $\pi_n :\ \ S_nW \longrightarrow S_n\overline{W}$ commute with the multiplication in the symmetric algebras, by taking duals we obtain a commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\overline{S}^*_A \arrow[r, "\pi^*_{S_a,A}"] \arrow[d, "\overline{\Delta}"'] & S^*_B \arrow[d, "\Delta"] \\
(\overline{V}_{A'} \cap \overline{V}_{A\smallsetminus A'})^* \otimes \overline{S}^*_{A'} \arrow[r, "\pi^*\otimes\pi^*_{S_a,A'}"] & (V_{B'} \cap V_{B\smallsetminus B'})^* \otimes S^*_{B'}.
\end{tikzcd} \tag{14.7}$$

Now we consider the following diagram:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\overline{T}_A \arrow[r, "1\otimes\mathbf{d}"] \arrow[d, "\overline{\Delta}\otimes\boldsymbol{\delta}\otimes\overline{\mathbf{a}}"'] & T^{(1)}_{AB} \arrow[r, "\tau"] \arrow[d, "\overline{\Delta}\otimes\boldsymbol{\delta}\otimes\overline{\mathbf{a}}\otimes 1"'] & T^{(2)}_{AB} \arrow[r, "\pi^*_{S_a,A}\otimes\wedge\otimes\mathbf{c}"] \arrow[d, "\overline{\Delta}\otimes\boldsymbol{\delta}\otimes 1\otimes\overline{\mathbf{a}}\otimes 1"] & T_B \arrow[d, "\Delta\otimes\boldsymbol{\delta}\otimes\mathbf{a}"] \\
\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{AA'} \arrow[r, "1\otimes\mathbf{d}"'] \arrow[d, "\tau"'] & \mathcal{Q}^{(1)} \arrow[r, "\tau"'] \arrow[d, "\tau"'] & \mathcal{Q}^{(2)} \arrow[r, "\pi^*\otimes\pi^*_{S_a,A'}\otimes 1\otimes\wedge\otimes\wedge\overline{\pi}^*\otimes\mathbf{c}'"'] \arrow[d, "\tau"] & \mathcal{Q}_{BB'} \arrow[d, "\tau"] \\
\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{AA'} \arrow[r, "1\otimes\mathbf{d}"] \arrow[d, "\overline{\mathbf{b}}\otimes\overline{\phi}\otimes 1"'] & \mathcal{R}^{(1)} \arrow[r, "\tau"] \arrow[d, "\overline{\mathbf{b}}\otimes\overline{\phi}\otimes 1"'] & \mathcal{R}^{(2)} \arrow[r, "\pi^*\otimes\wedge\overline{\pi}^*\otimes 1\otimes\pi^*_{S_a,A'}\otimes\wedge\otimes\mathbf{c}'"] \arrow[d, "\overline{\mathbf{b}}\otimes\overline{\phi}\otimes 1"] & \mathcal{R}_{BB'} \arrow[d, "\mathbf{b}\otimes\phi\otimes 1"] \\
\overline{\mathcal{S}}_{AA'} \arrow[r, "1\otimes\mathbf{d}"] \arrow[d, "\mu\otimes 1"'] & \mathcal{S}^{(1)} \arrow[r, "\tau"] \arrow[d, "\mu\otimes 1"'] & \mathcal{S}^{(2)} \arrow[r, "\wedge\pi^*\otimes\pi'\otimes\pi^*_{S_a,A'}\otimes\wedge\otimes\mathbf{c}'"] \arrow[d, "\mu\otimes 1"] & \mathcal{S}_{BB'} \arrow[d, "\mu\otimes 1"] \\
\overline{T}_{A'} \arrow[r, "1\otimes\mathbf{d}"] & T^{(1)}_{A'B'} \arrow[r, "\tau"] & T^{(2)}_{A'B'} \arrow[r, "\pi^*_{S_a,A'}\otimes\wedge\otimes\mathbf{c}'"] & T_{B'}
\end{tikzcd} \tag{14.8}$$

where we use $\overline{}$ to denote objects for $\mathbf{M}.S_a$, we use $\mathring{\wedge}\, X$ for the d-th exterior power of a vector space X of dimension d, and

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{Q}^{(1)} &= \overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{AA'} \otimes U_a \otimes V^*_a \\
&= (\overline{V}_{A'} \cap \overline{V}_{A\smallsetminus A'})^* \otimes \overline{S}^*_{A'} \otimes \mathring{\wedge}\, U_{A\smallsetminus A'} \otimes \mathring{\wedge}\, U_{A'} \otimes \mathring{\wedge}\, \overline{K}^*_{AA'} \otimes \mathring{\wedge}\, \overline{V}^*_{A'} \otimes U_a \otimes V^*_a; \\
\mathcal{Q}^{(2)} &= (\overline{V}_{A'} \cap \overline{V}_{A\smallsetminus A'})^* \otimes \overline{S}^*_{A'} \otimes \mathring{\wedge}\, U_{A\smallsetminus A'} \otimes \mathring{\wedge}\, U_{A'} \otimes U_a \otimes \mathring{\wedge}\, \overline{K}^*_{AA'} \otimes \mathring{\wedge}\, \overline{V}^*_{A'} \otimes V^*_a;
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{R}^{(1)} &= \overline{\mathcal{R}}_{AA'} \otimes U_a \otimes V^*_a \\
&= (\overline{V}_{A'} \cap \overline{V}_{A\smallsetminus A'})^* \otimes \mathring{\wedge}\, \overline{K}^*_{AA'} \otimes \mathring{\wedge}\, U_{A\smallsetminus A'} \otimes \overline{S}^*_{A'} \otimes \mathring{\wedge}\, U_{A'} \otimes \mathring{\wedge}\, \overline{V}^*_{A'} \otimes U_a \otimes V^*_a; \\
\mathcal{R}^{(2)} &= (\overline{V}_{A'} \cap \overline{V}_{A\smallsetminus A'})^* \otimes \mathring{\wedge}\, \overline{K}^*_{AA'} \otimes \mathring{\wedge}\, U_{A\smallsetminus A'} \otimes \overline{S}^*_{A'} \otimes \mathring{\wedge}\, U_{A'} \otimes U_a \otimes \mathring{\wedge}\, \overline{V}^*_{A'} \otimes V^*_a;
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{S}^{(1)} &= \overline{\mathcal{S}}_{AA'} \otimes U_a \otimes V^*_a \\
&= \mathring{\wedge}\, \overline{V}^*_{A\smallsetminus A'} \otimes \mathring{\wedge}\, \overline{V}_{A\smallsetminus A'} \otimes \overline{S}^*_{A'} \otimes \mathring{\wedge}\, U_{A'} \otimes \mathring{\wedge}\, \overline{V}^*_{A'} \otimes U_a \otimes V^*_a; \\
\mathcal{S}^{(2)} &= \mathring{\wedge}\, \overline{V}^*_{A\smallsetminus A'} \otimes \mathring{\wedge}\, \overline{V}_{A\smallsetminus A'} \otimes \overline{S}^*_{A'} \otimes \mathring{\wedge}\, U_{A'} \otimes U_a \otimes \mathring{\wedge}\, \overline{V}^*_{A'} \otimes V^*_a.
\end{aligned}$$

Since the second column (from the left) is obtained from the first column by tensoring with $U_a \otimes V^*_a$, the squares that involve only these two columns commute. The squares that involve only the second and third columns commute for trivial reasons. Next, look at the squares that involve only the third and the last column.

The top one commutes because the diagrams (14.7), (14.3), and (14.4) commute. The second one (from the top) commutes for trivial reasons. The third and the last squares commute because the canonical diagrams (14.5) and (14.6) commute. Thus the diagram (14.8) is commutative. Note that the composition of the maps in its top and bottom rows give $(\pi.S_a)_A$ and $(\pi.S_a)_{A'}$, respectively. Also, the composition of the maps in the first and the last columns give $(\phi.Y)_n^{AA'}$ and $\phi_n^{BB'}$ respectively. Since $|A'|+1=|B'|$, this yields the desired commutativity of (14.2) in the case when $B'=A'\cup\{a\}$.

Now we turn to the only other possible case: when $B'=A'$. Then the map $\pi\colon\ V_{B'}\longrightarrow\overline{V}_{A'}$ is an isomorphism, and the map $\overline{\pi}$ induces as usual a canonical isomorphism

$$\mathbf{c}''\colon\ \mathring{\wedge}\,\overline{K}^*_{AA'}\otimes V_a^*\longrightarrow\mathring{\wedge}\,K^*_{BB'}.$$

Furthermore, π induces a canonical isomorphism

$$\mathbf{b}'\colon\ \mathring{\wedge}\,\overline{V}^*_{A\smallsetminus A'}\otimes V_a^*\longrightarrow\mathring{\wedge}\,V^*_{B\smallsetminus B'},$$

and, in conjunction with the exact sequence

$$0\longrightarrow U_a\xrightarrow{\phi}V_{B\smallsetminus B'}\xrightarrow{\pi}\overline{V}_{A\smallsetminus A'}\longrightarrow 0,$$

also the canonical isomorphism

$$\pi''\colon\ \mathring{\wedge}\,\overline{V}_{A\smallsetminus A'}\otimes U_a\longrightarrow\mathring{\wedge}\,V_{B\smallsetminus B'}.$$

In particular, the diagram

(14.9)
$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathring{\wedge}\,U_{A\smallsetminus A'}\otimes U_a \arrow[r, "\wedge"] \arrow[d, "\wedge\overline{\phi}\otimes 1"'] & \mathring{\wedge}\,U_{B\smallsetminus B'} \arrow[d, "\wedge\phi"] \\
\mathring{\wedge}\,\overline{V}_{A\smallsetminus A'}\otimes U_a \arrow[r, "\pi''"] & \mathring{\wedge}\,V_{B\smallsetminus B'}
\end{tikzcd}$$

is commutative. Furthermore, it is routine to check that the canonically induced diagrams

(14.10)
$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathring{\wedge}\,\overline{V}^*_A\otimes V_a^* \arrow[r, "="] \arrow[d, "\overline{\mathbf{a}}\otimes 1"'] & \mathring{\wedge}\,\overline{V}^*_A\otimes V_a^* \arrow[r, "\mathbf{c}"] & \mathring{\wedge}\,V^*_B \arrow[d, "(-1)^{(\overline{r}_{A'})}\mathbf{a}"] \\
\mathring{\wedge}\,\overline{K}^*_{AA'}\otimes\mathring{\wedge}\,\overline{V}^*_{A'}\otimes V_a^* \arrow[r, "\tau"] & \mathring{\wedge}\,\overline{K}^*_{AA'}\otimes V_a^*\otimes\mathring{\wedge}\,\overline{V}^*_{A'} \arrow[r, "\mathbf{c}''\otimes\wedge\pi^*"] & \mathring{\wedge}\,K^*_{BB'}\otimes\mathring{\wedge}\,\overline{V}^*_{B'}
\end{tikzcd}$$

and

(14.11)
$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathring{\wedge}\,U_A\otimes U_a \arrow[r, "="] \arrow[d, "\boldsymbol{\delta}\otimes 1"'] & \mathring{\wedge}\,U_A\otimes U_a \arrow[r, "\wedge"] & \mathring{\wedge}\,U_B \arrow[d, "(-1)^{|A'|}\boldsymbol{\delta}"] \\
\mathring{\wedge}\,U_{A\smallsetminus A'}\otimes\mathring{\wedge}\,U_{A'}\otimes U_a \arrow[r, "\tau"] & \mathring{\wedge}\,U_{A\smallsetminus A'}\otimes U_a\otimes\mathring{\wedge}\,U_{A'} \arrow[r, "\wedge\otimes 1"] & \mathring{\wedge}\,U_{B\smallsetminus B'}\otimes\mathring{\wedge}\,U_{B'}
\end{tikzcd}$$

together with

(14.12)
$$\begin{tikzcd}
(\overline{V}_{A'}\cap\overline{V}_{A\smallsetminus A'})^*\otimes\mathring{\wedge}\,\overline{K}^*_{AA'}\otimes V_a^* \arrow[r, "\pi^*\otimes\mathbf{c}''"] \arrow[d, "\overline{\mathbf{b}}\otimes 1"'] & (V_{B'}\cap V_{B\smallsetminus B'})^*\otimes\mathring{\wedge}\,K^*_{BB'} \arrow[d, "\mathbf{b}"] \\
\mathring{\wedge}\,\overline{V}^*_{A\smallsetminus A'}\otimes V_a^* \arrow[r, "\mathbf{b}'"] & \mathring{\wedge}\,V^*_{B\smallsetminus B'}
\end{tikzcd}$$

and

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathring{\wedge}\,\overline{V}^*_{A\smallsetminus A'} \otimes \mathring{\wedge}\,\overline{V}_{A\smallsetminus A'} \otimes U_a \otimes V_a^* \arrow[r, "\mu\otimes\mathbf{d}^{-1}"] \arrow[d, "\tau"'] & \Bbbk \arrow[d, "="] \\
\mathring{\wedge}\,\overline{V}^*_{A\smallsetminus A'} \otimes V_a^* \otimes \mathring{\wedge}\,\overline{V}_{A\smallsetminus A'} \otimes U_a \arrow[d, "\mathbf{b}'\otimes\pi''"'] & \Bbbk \arrow[d, "="] \\
\mathring{\wedge}\,V^*_{B\smallsetminus B'} \otimes \mathring{\wedge}\,V_{B\smallsetminus B'} \arrow[r, "\mu"] & \Bbbk
\end{tikzcd} \tag{14.13}$$

are commutative. We write $\mathbf{q_1}$ ($\mathbf{q_2}$, respectively) for the composition of the maps in the bottom row of (14.10) (of (14.11), respectively). Now we consider the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\overline{T}_A \arrow[r, "1\otimes\mathbf{d}"] \arrow[d, "\overline{\Delta}\otimes\boldsymbol{\delta}\otimes\overline{\mathbf{a}}"'] & T^{(1)}_{AB} \arrow[r, "\tau"] \arrow[d, "\overline{\Delta}\otimes\boldsymbol{\delta}\otimes\overline{\mathbf{a}}\otimes 1"] & T^{(2)}_{AB} \arrow[r, "\pi^*_{S_a,A}\otimes\wedge\otimes\mathbf{c}"] \arrow[d, "\overline{\Delta}\otimes\boldsymbol{\delta}\otimes 1\otimes\overline{\mathbf{a}}\otimes 1"] & T_B \arrow[d, "(-1)^n\Delta\otimes\boldsymbol{\delta}\otimes\mathbf{a}"'] \\
\overline{\mathcal{Q}}_{AA'} \arrow[r, "1\otimes\mathbf{d}"'] \arrow[d, "\tau"'] & \mathcal{Q}^{(1)} \arrow[r, "\tau"'] \arrow[d, "\tau"] & \mathcal{Q}^{(2)} \arrow[r, "\pi^*\otimes\pi^*_{S_a,A'}\otimes\mathbf{q_2}\otimes\mathbf{q_1}"'] \arrow[d, "\tau"] & \mathcal{Q}_{BB'} \arrow[d, "\tau"'] \\
\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{AA'} \arrow[r, "1\otimes\mathbf{d}"] \arrow[d, "\overline{\mathbf{b}}\otimes\overline{\phi}\otimes 1"'] & \mathcal{R}^{(1)} \arrow[r, "\tau"] \arrow[d, "\overline{\mathbf{b}}\otimes\overline{\phi}\otimes 1"] & \mathcal{R}^{(3)} \arrow[r, "\pi^*\otimes\mathbf{c}''\otimes\wedge\otimes\pi^*_{S_a,A'}\otimes 1\otimes\wedge\pi^*"] \arrow[d, "\overline{\mathbf{b}}\otimes 1\otimes\overline{\phi}\otimes 1"] & \mathcal{R}_{BB'} \arrow[d, "\mathbf{b}\otimes\phi\otimes 1"'] \\
\overline{\mathcal{S}}_{AA'} \arrow[r, "1\otimes\mathbf{d}"] \arrow[d, "\mu\otimes 1"'] & \mathcal{S}^{(1)} \arrow[r, "\tau"] \arrow[d, "\mu\otimes 1\otimes\mathbf{d}^{-1}"] & \mathcal{S}^{(3)} \arrow[r, "\mathbf{b}'\otimes\pi''\otimes\pi^*_{S_a,A'}\otimes 1\otimes\wedge\pi^*"] & \mathcal{S}_{BB'} \arrow[d, "\mu\otimes 1"'] \\
\overline{T}_{A'} \arrow[r, "="] & T^{(1)}_{A'B'} \arrow[r, "="] & T^{(2)}_{A'B'} \arrow[r, "\pi^*_{S_a,A'}\otimes 1\otimes\wedge\pi^*"] & T_{B'},
\end{tikzcd} \tag{14.14}$$

where

$$\mathcal{R}^{(3)} = (\overline{V}_{A'} \cap \overline{V}_{A\smallsetminus A'})^* \otimes \mathring{\wedge}\,\overline{K}^*_{AA'} \otimes V_a^* \otimes \mathring{\wedge}\,U_{A\smallsetminus A'} \otimes U_a \otimes \overline{S}^*_{A'} \otimes \mathring{\wedge}\,U_{A'} \otimes \mathring{\wedge}\,\overline{V}^*_{A'};$$

$$\mathcal{S}^{(3)} = \mathring{\wedge}\,\overline{V}^*_{A\smallsetminus A'} \otimes V_a^* \otimes \mathring{\wedge}\,\overline{V}_{A\smallsetminus A'} \otimes U_a \otimes \overline{S}^*_{A'} \otimes \mathring{\wedge}\,U_{A'} \otimes \mathring{\wedge}\,\overline{V}^*_{A'}.$$

This diagram differs in several places from (14.8). We will show that it is commutative. The squares that involve the first two columns (from the left) are commutative because they are the same as in (14.8), except for the bottom one, which commutes for trivial reasons. Among the three squares that involve the second and third column, we only need to consider the one involving $\mathcal{S}^{(3)}$, but that one is commutative for trivial reasons as well. Next comes the parallelogram with corners in $\mathcal{S}^{(1)}$, $\mathcal{S}_{BB'}$, $T_{B'}$, and $T^{(1)}_{A'B'}$; it is commutative because of the commutativity of (14.13). Finally, we deal with the three squares that involve the third and the fourth columns. The top one commutes because (14.7), (14.10), and (14.11) commute, plus the fact that

$$(-1)^{\overline{r}_{A'}}(-1)^{|A'|} = (-1)^{|A'|-\overline{r}_{A'}} = (-1)^n.$$

The second square from the top commutes for trivial reasons, and the third square from the top commutes because (14.9) and (14.12) are commutative. Therefore the diagram (14.14) is commutative. The desired commutativity of (14.2) is now immediate by looking at the outer rows and columns of (14.14). The proof of the proposition is now complete. □

Proof of Theorem 13.7. Since each map $\pi^*_{Y,A}$ is injective (as the dual of a surjective map) the map $(\pi.Y)_n$ is injective for each $n \geq 0$. Thus it remains to show that $(\pi.Y)_\bullet$ is a morphism of complexes. Furthermore, by Theorem 13.6 it suffices to prove our theorem under the assumption that $Y = S_a$ with $\{a\}$ an independent set in $\mathbf{M}$. So let A be a T-flat in $\mathbf{M}.S_a$ of level $n \geq 1$. It suffices to show that

$$(\pi.S_a)_{n-1} \circ (\phi.S_a)_n\big|_{T_A(\phi.S_a)} = \phi_n \circ (\pi.S_a)_n\big|_{T_A(\phi.S_a)}.$$

Let $B = S \smallsetminus (S_a \smallsetminus A)^{\complement_{\mathbf{M}^*}}$, and observe that if B'' is a T-flat inside B of level $n-1$ which is not of the form $S \smallsetminus (S_a \smallsetminus A')^{\complement_{\mathbf{M}^*}}$ for some T-flat $A' \subset A$ in $\mathbf{M}.S_a$ of level $n-1$, then by Theorem 8.3 we must have that $(B \smallsetminus B'') \cap S_a = \varnothing$. Therefore (since the T-part $B \smallsetminus B''$ is nonempty) we must have that $B \smallsetminus B'' = \{a\}$, hence $\{a\}$ is a T-part of B and $B'' = A$. In particular, by Theorem 11.4 we obtain that the composition $\phi_n^{BB''} \circ \pi^*_{S_a,A} = 0$. The desired conclusion is now immediate in view of the commutativity of (14.2). □

15. ACYCLICITY

In this section $\phi\colon\ U_S \longrightarrow W$ is a representation over $\Bbbk$ of a matroid $\mathbf{M}$ on a finite set S. We tie the remaining loose ends by presenting the proofs of Theorem 6.4, Theorem 6.5, Theorem 6.6, and Theorem 11.5. We begin with a lemma.

Lemma 15.1. *The image of the augmentation map* $\phi_0\colon\ T_0(\phi) \longrightarrow U_S$ *is precisely* $\operatorname{Im}(\phi_0) = \operatorname{Ker}(\phi)$.

Proof. Let I be a circuit of $\mathbf{M}$. Since T_I is a 1-dimensional vector space and for each $a \in I$ the map $\phi_0^{I,a}\colon\ T_I \longrightarrow U_a$ is an isomorphism, the map $\phi_0\big|_{T_I} = -\sum_{a\in I} \phi_0^{I,a}$ is injective; therefore $0 \neq \phi_0(T_I) \subseteq \operatorname{Ker}(\phi|I)$ and hence $\phi_0(T_I) = \operatorname{Ker}(\phi|I)$ because $\operatorname{Ker}(\phi|I)$ is 1-dimensional due to the fact that I is a circuit. Thus we obtain

$$\phi_0(T_I) = \sum_{I\in\mathcal{T}_0(\mathbf{M})} \operatorname{Ker}(\phi|I)$$

and so it suffices to show that $\operatorname{Ker}(\phi) = \sum_{I\in\mathcal{T}_0(\mathbf{M})} \operatorname{Ker}(\phi|I)$. For each circuit I let

$$v_I = \sum_{a\in I} d_{I,a} e_a$$

be a basis vector for the 1-dimensional space $\operatorname{Ker}(\phi|I)$. By Remark 9.3(b) we have $d_{I,a} \neq 0$ for each $a \in I$. For a vector $v = \sum_{a\in S} c_a e_a$ in U_S let $supp(v) = \{a \in S \mid c_a \neq 0\}$. Suppose that v is a vector in $\operatorname{Ker}(\phi)$ but not in $K' = \sum_{I\in\mathcal{T}_0(\mathbf{M})} \operatorname{Ker}(\phi|I)$ and of smallest support. Then $A = supp(v)$ is a dependent set in $\mathbf{M}$, hence contains a circuit I. Let a be an element of I. But then the vector $w = d_{I,a} v - c_a v_I$ has smaller support than v. □

Lemma 15.2. *Let Y be a subset of S such that $S \smallsetminus Y$ is independent in $\mathbf{M}$. Then the diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
T_0(\phi.Y) \arrow[r, "(\phi.Y)_0"] \arrow[d, "(\pi.Y)_0^{\phi}"'] & U_Y \\
T_0(\phi) \arrow[r, "\phi_0"] & U_S \arrow[u, "\mathbf{proj}."']
\end{tikzcd}$$

is commutative.

Proof. By Theorem 13.6 it is enough to consider the case when $Y = S_a$ with $\{a\}$ independent in $\mathbf{M}$, so we assume this is the situation. Then it suffices to show that for each circuit A in $\mathbf{M}.S_a$ and each element $c \in A$ the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
T_A(\phi.S_a) \arrow[r, "(\phi.S_a)_0^{A,c}"] \arrow[d, "(\pi.S_a)_A^{\phi}"'] & U_c \arrow[d, "="] \\
T_B(\phi) \arrow[r, "\phi_0^{B,c}"] & U_c
\end{tikzcd}$$

is commutative, where $B = S \smallsetminus (S_a \smallsetminus A)^{\complement_{\mathbf{M}^*}}$. This is trivially true when $B = A$. In the only other possible case $B = A \cup \{a\}$, we consider the diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\overline{T}_A \arrow[r, "\tau\circ(\boldsymbol{\delta}\otimes 1)"] \arrow[d, "\tau\circ(1\otimes\mathbf{d})"'] & \mathring{\bigwedge} U_{A\smallsetminus c} \otimes \mathring{\bigwedge} \overline{V}^*_{A\smallsetminus c} \otimes U_c \arrow[r, "\mu\circ(\wedge\phi\otimes 1)"] \arrow[d, "\tau\circ(1\otimes\mathbf{d})"'] & U_c \arrow[d, "="] \\
T^{(2)}_{AB} \arrow[r, "\tau\circ(\boldsymbol{\delta}\otimes 1)"] \arrow[d, "\wedge\otimes\mathbf{c}"'] & \mathring{\bigwedge} U_{A\smallsetminus c} \otimes \mathring{\bigwedge} \overline{V}^*_{A\smallsetminus c} \otimes U_a \otimes V_a^* \otimes U_c \arrow[r, "(\mu\otimes\mu)\circ(\wedge\phi\otimes 1\otimes\phi\otimes 1)"] \arrow[d, "(\wedge\otimes\mathbf{c})\circ\tau"'] & U_c \arrow[d, "="] \\
T_B \arrow[r, "\tau\circ(\boldsymbol{\delta}\otimes 1)"] & \mathring{\bigwedge} U_{B\smallsetminus c} \otimes \mathring{\bigwedge} V^*_{B\smallsetminus c} \otimes U_c \arrow[r, "\mu\circ(\wedge\phi\otimes 1)"] & U_c
\end{tikzcd}$$

where we use notation as in the proof of Theorem 14.1. The two squares that involve the left column of this diagram commute for trivial reasons, and it is a routine exercise in multilinear algebra to verify that the two squares involving the right column also commute. Thus this diagram is commutative. The assertion of the lemma is now immediate. ☐

Proof of Theorems 6.4, 6.5, and 11.5. Note that by Lemma 15.1, Theorem 13.6, and Theorem 13.7, it is enough to prove by induction on $m = |S|$ that

1. The complex $T_\bullet(\phi)$ is a resolution of $\mathrm{Ker}(\phi)$;
2. Theorem 11.5 holds; and
3. If $\{a\}$ is independent in $\mathbf{M}$ then the morphism $(\pi.S_a)_\bullet^{\phi}\colon T_\bullet(\phi.S_a) \longrightarrow T_\bullet(\phi)$ is an isomorphism in homology.

These statements are true trivially when $m = 0$. More generally, when ϕ is a representation of a uniform matroid assertion (1) is true by Example 5.7; the matroid $\mathbf{M}.S_a$ is also uniform and therefore in view of Example 3.10 assertion (2) is just a well known property of symmetric powers; while (3) follows from (1) in view of Lemmas 15.2 and 15.1, and the fact that by the independence of $\{a\}$ the canonical projection $U_S \longrightarrow U_{S_a}$ induces an isomorphism of $\mathrm{Ker}(\phi)$ onto $\mathrm{Ker}(\phi.S_a)$. In particular, assertions (1), (2), and (3) are true also in the case $m = 1$.

Next, we assume that $m \geq 2$, that $\mathbf{M}$ is not uniform, and that our assertions are true for smaller values of $|S|$. Furthermore, by Theorem 6.3, Theorem 11.1, and Theorem 10.5 we may assume that S is connected (hence the unique largest T-flat is S itself and therefore $\ell_S^{\mathbf{M}} \geq 1$ by the non-uniformity of $\mathbf{M}$).

In addition, suppose $c \in S$ is such that $\{c\}$ is not a T-part of S. Then $\{c\}$ is independent and is not a T-part of any T-flat of $\mathbf{M}$, hence by Theorem 11.4 the canonical morphism $(\pi.S_c)_\bullet^\phi \colon\ T_\bullet(\phi.S_c) \longrightarrow T_\bullet(\phi)$ is an isomorphism and therefore (1) is true by the induction hypothesis. Also, if $a = c$ then (3) is trivial. Furthermore, when $\{a\}$ is independent and $a \neq c$ then both $\{a\}$ is independent in $\mathbf{M}.S_c$ as well as $\{c\}$ is independent in $\mathbf{M}.S_a$ (otherwise $\{a, c\}$ is a circuit in $\mathbf{M}$ hence either $S = \{a, c\}$ which contradicts $\ell_S^{\mathbf{M}} \geq 1$, or $\{a, c\}$ is a T-part of S which contradicts the connectedness of S, or $\{a, c\}$ is a disjoint union of at least two nonempty T-parts of S which is ruled out because $\{c\}$ is not a T-part of S); thus by Theorem 13.6

$$\begin{tikzcd}
T_\bullet(\phi.S_{ac}) \arrow[r, "(\pi.S_{ac})_\bullet^{\phi.S_a}"] \arrow[d, "(\pi.S_{ac})_\bullet^{\phi.S_c}"'] & T_\bullet(\phi.S_a) \arrow[d, "(\pi.S_a)_\bullet^\phi"] \\
T_\bullet(\phi.S_c) \arrow[r, "(\pi.S_c)_\bullet^\phi"] & T_\bullet(\phi)
\end{tikzcd}$$

is a commutative diagram, where $S_{ac} = S \smallsetminus \{a, c\}$. It follows that $(\pi.S_a)_\bullet^\phi$ is an isomorphism in homology because the other three maps in that diagram are isomorphisms in homology (here we are applying to the morphisms $(\pi.S_{ac})_\bullet^{\phi.S_a}$ and $(\pi.S_{ac})_\bullet^{\phi.S_c}$ our induction hypothesis). Thus (3) is true. Finally, let $\{a\}$ be independent in $\mathbf{M}$, and let A be a T-flat of $\mathbf{M}.S_a$ such that $\{a\}$ is a T-part of $B = S \smallsetminus (S_a \smallsetminus A)^{\complement_{\mathbf{M}^*}}$. If $B \neq S$ then (2) holds for A and B by passing to $\phi|B$ and applying our induction hypothesis. If $B = S$ then necessarily $A = S_a$ and $\{a\}$ is a T-part of S. It follows that $a \neq c$ and that $\{a\}$ is an independent T-part of S_c in $\mathbf{M}.S_c$. Then by Theorem 11.4 we have $S_{S_a}(\phi.S_a) \cong S_{S_{ac}}(\phi.S_{ac})$ and $S_S(\phi) \cong S_{S_c}(\phi.S_c)$ as well as $S_{S_a}(\phi) \cong S_{S_{ac}}(\phi.S_c)$, thus by our induction hypothesis

$$\dim S_S(\phi) = \dim S_{S_a}(\phi.S_a) + \dim S_{S_a}(\phi)$$

and therefore (2) holds in this last remaining case by Theorem 11.4(2).

Summarizing the last paragraph, if S has a T-part that is not a singleton, then (1), (2), and (3) hold. Therefore in the sequel we will always assume that every T-part of the connected T-flat S is (independent and) a singleton.

Let $a \in S$. By our induction hypothesis the complex $T_\bullet(\phi.S_a)$ is a resolution of $\operatorname{Ker}(\phi.S_a)$, and for every T-flat A in $\mathbf{M}.S_a$ such that $A \neq S_a$ and such that $\{a\}$ is a T-part of $B = S \smallsetminus (S_a \smallsetminus A)^{\complement_{\mathbf{M}^*}}$ the sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow S_A(\phi) \otimes V_a(\phi) \xrightarrow{\nu} S_B(\phi) \xrightarrow{\pi_{S_a,A}^\phi} S_A(\phi.S_a) \longrightarrow 0$$

is exact. It remains to show that $T_\bullet(\phi)$ is a resolution of $\operatorname{Ker}(\phi)$, that the sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow S_{S_a}(\phi) \otimes V_a(\phi) \xrightarrow{\nu} S_S(\phi) \xrightarrow{\pi_{S_a,S_a}^\phi} S_{S_a}(\phi.S_a) \longrightarrow 0 \tag{15.3}$$

is exact, and that $(\pi.S_a)_\bullet^\phi$ is an isomorphism in homology. Consider the exact sequence of complexes

$$0 \longrightarrow T_\bullet(\phi.S_a) \xrightarrow{(\pi.S_a)_\bullet^\phi} T_\bullet(\phi) \longrightarrow C \longrightarrow 0$$

where by definition $C = \operatorname{Coker}(\pi.S_a)^{\phi}_{\bullet}$. Let $n = \ell^{\mathbf{M}}_S = \ell^{\mathbf{M}.S_a}_{S_a}$. Since $\mathbf{M}$ is not uniform and every T-part of S is an independent singleton we have $n \geq 2$. Thus $\mathrm{H}_{n-1}(T_\bullet(\phi.S_a)) = 0$, and since $T_n(\phi) = T_S(\phi)$ the map $\phi_n \colon\ T_n(\phi) \longrightarrow T_{n-1}(\phi)$ is injective by Remark 5.3. Thus the long homology exact sequence yields $\mathrm{H}_n(C) = 0$, and therefore the differential $c_n \colon\ C_n \longrightarrow C_{n-1}$ is injective. On the other hand,

$$C_n = \big(S^*_S(\phi)/\pi^*_{S_a,S_a}[S_{S_a}(\phi.S_a)^*]\big) \otimes \mathring{\bigwedge} U_S \otimes \mathring{\bigwedge} V^*_S$$

and C_{n-1} is the direct sum of $T_{S_a}(\phi) = S_{S_a}(\phi)^* \otimes \mathring{\bigwedge} U_{S_a} \otimes \mathring{\bigwedge} V^*_{S_a}$ with all components of the form

$$\big(S_X(\phi)^*/\pi^*_{S_a,X\smallsetminus a}[S_{X\smallsetminus a}(\phi.S_a)^*]\big) \otimes \mathring{\bigwedge} U_X \otimes \mathring{\bigwedge} V^*_X$$

where X is a T-flat in S of level $n-1$ such that $\{a\}$ is a T-part of X. In fact, by Theorem 8.4 and Theorem 11.4 in every degree k the space C_k is the direct sum C'_k of all components of the form $T_Z(\phi)$ for Z a T-flat in $\mathbf{M}$ of level k such that $a \notin Z$ and $Z \cup \{a\}$ is a T-flat in $\mathbf{M}$ of level $k+1$; plus the direct sum C''_{k-1} of all components of the form

$$C''_X = \big(S_X(\phi)^*/\pi^*_{S_a,X\smallsetminus a}[S_{X\smallsetminus a}(\phi.S_a)^*]\big) \otimes \mathring{\bigwedge} U_X \otimes \mathring{\bigwedge} V^*_X$$

where X is a T-flat in S of level k such that $\{a\}$ is a T-part of X. In particular we have $C_n = C''_{n-1}$ and $C'_{n-1} = T_{S_a}(\phi)$. Furthermore, it is clear from the definitions that $C' = C'_\bullet$ is a subcomplex of C, and that the shifted down quotient complex $C'' = (C/C')[1]$ has component C''_k in homological degree k.

Now, for each component C''_X of C''_k, the map

$$(-1)^{|X\smallsetminus\{a\}|}\phi_k^{X,X\smallsetminus\{a\}} \ :\ \ T_X(\phi) \longrightarrow T_{X\smallsetminus\{a\}}(\phi)$$

induces by Theorem 11.4 a surjective homomorphism $\gamma^X_k \colon\ C''_X \longrightarrow T_{X\smallsetminus\{a\}}(\phi)$, and it is straightforward to verify that this induces a surjective morphism of complexes $\gamma \colon\ C'' \longrightarrow C'$ such that C is precisely the mapping cone of γ. Furthermore, by our induction hypothesis γ_k is in fact an isomorphism except possibly for $k = n-1$. It follows that $\mathrm{H}_k(C) = 0$ for $k \leq n-1$, and $\mathrm{H}_n(C) \cong \operatorname{Ker}(\gamma^S_{n-1})$. Since we know that $\mathrm{H}_n(C) = 0$ (because c_n is injective), we conclude as desired that the sequence (15.3) is exact, and that the complex C is exact. Therefore, the map $(\pi.S_a)^{\phi}_{\bullet}$ is a quasiisomorphism and the complex $T_\bullet(\phi)$ is a resolution of $\operatorname{Ker}(\phi.S_a) \cong \operatorname{Ker}(\phi)$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 6.6. In view of Theorem 11.1 and Theorem 10.5 it suffices to consider the case when $A = S$ is a connected T-flat of $\mathbf{M}$. We induce on the level n of S. The case $n = 0$ is trivial. When $n \geq 1$ the assertion follows from Theorem 6.5 due to the fact that the nonzero component of $T_\bullet(\phi)$ of highest homological degree is $T_n(\phi) = T_S(\phi) \cong S_S(\phi)^*$ and its dimension is the alternating sum of the dimensions of the components in lower homological degrees. The dimensions of these lower components however are invariants of $\mathbf{M}$ by our induction hypothesis. $\square$

16. Appendix on matroids

The appendix contains some general results about matroids that will be needed at one point or another in our exposition. They are elementary in nature and well known. Due to the lack of appropriate references, and also for completeness, we have included their short proofs.

Throughout this section $\mathbf{M}$ is a matroid on a finite set S, and all sets considered are subsets of S.

Lemma 16.1. *If $J \subseteq I$ then $|J| - r_J \leq |I| - r_I$.*

Proof. Let J' be a maximal independent subset of J, and let I' be an extension of J' to a maximal independent subset of I. Thus $J' = I' \cap J$ hence

$$r_I - r_J = |I' \smallsetminus J'| \leq |I \smallsetminus J| = |I| - |J|.$$

The desired conclusion is now immediate. □

Lemma 16.2. *Let I and J be sets such that*

$$|I| - r_I = |J| - r_J = |I \cup J| - r_{I \cup J} = k$$

for some k. Then also $|I \cap J| - r_{I \cap J} = k$.

Proof. We have $|I \cap J| = |I| + |J| - |I \cup J|$ and $r_{I \cap J} \leq r_I + r_J - r_{I \cup J}$. So

$$k \geq |I \cap J| - r_{I \cap J} \geq |I| + |J| - |I \cup J| - r_I - r_J + r_{I \cup J} \geq k + k - k = k,$$

where the first inequality is by Lemma 16.1. The desired conclusion is now immediate. □

Lemma 16.3. *Let J be an independent subset disjoint from I such that $r_I + r_J = r_{I \cup J} + k$. If I' is a maximal independent subset of $I \cup J$ such that $I' \cap I$ is a maximal independent subset of I, then $|I' \cap J| = |J| - k$.*

Proof. We have the equalities $r_{I \cup J} = |I'|$ and $r_I = |I' \cap I|$. Since J is independent we get

$$|J| - k = r_J - k = r_{I \cup J} - r_I = |I'| - |I' \cap I| = |I' \cap J|,$$

which is the desired conclusion. □

Lemma 16.4. *Let J be an independent set disjoint from I and such that $r_J + r_I = r_{I \cup J} + k$. If J' is a subset of J and I' is a subset of I such that $r_{J'} + r_{I'} \geq r_{I' \cup J'} + k$, then we have $r_{J'} + r_{I'} = r_{I' \cup J'} + k$.*

Proof. Take a maximal independent subset I_1 of I' and extend it to a maximal independent subset I_2 of I. Extend I_2 to a maximal independent subset I_3 of $I \cup J'$, and then I_3 to a maximal independent subset I_4 of $I \cup J$. Let $I_3' = I_3 \cap J'$. Note that $I_4 \cap (I \cup J') = I_3$, so $I_4 \cap J' = I_3'$. On the other hand $|I_4 \cap J| = |J| - k$ by Lemma 16.3, hence $|I_3'| = |I_4 \cap J'| \geq |J'| - k$; thus

$$r_{I' \cup J'} \geq |I_4 \cap I'| + |I_4 \cap J'| \geq r_{I'} + |J'| - k = r_{I'} + r_{J'} - k \geq r_{I' \cup J'}.$$

The desired conclusion is now immediate. □

Lemma 16.5. *Let J be an independent set disjoint from I and such that $r_I + r_J = r_{I \cup J} + k$. If J' is a subset of J and I' is a subset of I such that $r_{J'} + r_{I'} = r_{I' \cup J'} + k$ then we have $r_{J \smallsetminus J'} + r_{I \cup J'} = r_{I \cup J}$.*

Proof. Let I_2 be a maximal independent subset of I such that $I_1 = I_2 \cap I'$ is a maximal independent subset of I'.

Let I_3 be any extension of I_2 to a maximal independent subset of $I \cup J$. We claim that $|I_3 \cap J'| = |J'| - k$ and $I_3 \cap (J \smallsetminus J') = J \smallsetminus J'$. Indeed, let $I_4 = I_3 \cap J'$. Since $I_3 \cap I = I_2$, we have

$$|I_3 \cap J| = |I_3| - |I_2| = r_{I \cup J} - r_I = r_J - k = |J| - k,$$

therefore $|I_4| \geq |J'| - k$; thus we get

$$r_{I'} + r_{J'} - k = r_{I' \cup J'} \geq |I_3 \cap (I' \cup J')| = |I_1| + |I_4| \geq r_{I'} + r_{J'} - k$$

whence the claimed equalities $|I_4| = |J'| - k$ and $I_3 \cap (J \smallsetminus J') = J \smallsetminus J'$.

Next, we prove that the set $I_3' = I_3 \cap (I \cup J')$ is a maximal independent subset of $I \cup J'$. It is certainly independent, hence contained in a maximal independent set I'' of $I \cup J'$. Since $I_2 \subset I_3'$, we have $I'' \cap I = I_2 = I_3' \cap I$. Extend I'' to a maximal independent set I_3'' of $I \cup J$. By the claim from previous paragraph $|I_3'' \cap J'| = |J'| - k$; therefore the inclusions

$$I_3 \cap J' = I_3' \cap J' \subseteq I'' \cap J' \subseteq I_3'' \cap J'$$

together with the equality $|I_3 \cap J'| = |J'| - k$ yield $I'' \cap J' = I_3' \cap J'$. Thus $I_3' = I''$, hence I_3' is a maximal independent subset of $I \cup J'$.

Finally, since $J \smallsetminus J' \subseteq I_3$, we observe that

$$r_{I \cup J} = |I_3| = |J \smallsetminus J'| + |I_3 \cap (I \cup J')| = r_{J \smallsetminus J'} + r_{I \cup J'},$$

which is the desired conclusion. □

Lemma 16.6. *Let $J \subseteq I_1 \subseteq I_2$ be sets with J independent and such that*

$$r_{I_2} - r_{I_2 \smallsetminus J} = r_{I_1} - r_{I_1 \smallsetminus J} = k.$$

If I is a set with $I_1 \subseteq I \subseteq I_2$, then $r_I - r_{I \smallsetminus J} = k$.

Proof. Let $I_1 \subseteq I \subseteq I_2$. Choose a maximal independent set B of I_2 such that the sets $B \cap (I_1 \smallsetminus J)$, $B \cap (I \smallsetminus J)$, and $B \cap (I_2 \smallsetminus J)$ are maximal independent subsets of $I_1 \smallsetminus J$, $I \smallsetminus J$, and $I_2 \smallsetminus J$, respectively. Let $B' = B \cap J$. Then

$$|B'| = |B| - |B \cap (I_2 \smallsetminus J)| = r_{I_2} - r_{I_2 \smallsetminus J} = k.$$

Furthermore $|B \cap I_1| = |B \cap (I_1 \smallsetminus J)| + |B'| = r_{I_1 \smallsetminus J} + k = r_{I_1}$, hence $B \cap I_1$ is a maximal independent subset of I_1. Then every element of I_1 is in the closure of $B \cap I_1$, and since every element of $I \smallsetminus J$ is in the closure of $B \cap (I \smallsetminus J)$, it follows that every element of $I = (I \smallsetminus J) \cup I_1$ is in the closure of $B \cap I$. Therefore $B \cap I$ is a maximal independent subset of I, thus $r_I = |B \cap I| = |B \cap (I \smallsetminus J)| + |B'| = r_{I \smallsetminus J} + k$. □

Lemma 16.7. *Let J be an independent subset of I such that $r_J + r_{I \smallsetminus J} = r_I$. If J' is a subset of J, then $r_{J'} + r_{I \smallsetminus J'} = r_I$.*

Proof. Assume $r_{J'} + r_{I \smallsetminus J'} \geq r_I + 1$. Then, since $r_{J \smallsetminus J'} + r_{J'} = r_J$, we would get

$$r_I = r_J + r_{I \smallsetminus J} = r_{J'} + r_{J \smallsetminus J'} + r_{I \smallsetminus J} \geq r_{J'} + r_{I \smallsetminus J'} \geq r_I + 1,$$

which is impossible. □

Lemma 16.8. *Let I_1 and I_2 be sets with $r_{I_1} + r_{I_2} = r_{I_1 \cup I_2}$, and let $J \subseteq I_1 \cup I_2$.*

The set J is a maximal independent subset of $I_1 \cup I_2$ if and only if the sets $J_1 = I_1 \cap J$ and $J_2 = I_2 \cap J$ are maximal independent subsets of I_1 and I_2, respectively.

Proof. Assume first that J is a maximal independent subset of $I = I_1 \cup I_2$. Then the sets J_1 and J_2 are independent, and $r_{J_1} + r_{J_2} \geq r_J = r_I$. Therefore we have

$$r_I = r_{I_1} + r_{I_2} \geq r_{J_1} + r_{J_2} \geq r_I,$$

thus necessarily $r_{I_i} = r_{J_i} = |J_i|$ for $i = 1, 2$.

Conversely, if J_1 and J_2 are maximal independent subsets of I_1 and I_2, respectively, then clearly every element of $I = I_1 \cup I_2$ is in the closure of $J = J_1 \cup J_2$. Therefore J contains a maximal independent subset J' of I. By the first part of the lemma we must have $J' \cap I_i = J_i$ for $i = 1, 2$, hence $J' = J$. □

Lemma 16.9. *Let* I_1 *and* I_2 *are sets with* $r_{I_1}+r_{I_2}=r_{I_1\cup I_2}$. *If* $J_1 \subseteq I_1$ *and* $J_2 \subseteq I_2$ *then* $r_{J_1}+r_{J_2}=r_{J_1\cup J_2}$.

Proof. Let $J = J_1 \cup J_2$, and let J_i' be a maximal independent subset of J_i for $i = 1, 2$. Then $r_{J_i} = |J_i'|$. Extend J_i' to a maximal independent subset I_i' of I_i. Then $I' = I_i' \cup I_2'$ is a maximal independent subset of $I = I_1 \cup I_2$ by Lemma 16.8, hence the set $J' = J_1' \cup J_2' \subseteq I' \cap J$ is an independent subset of J. Also note that $J_1' \cap J_2'$ is an independent subset of $I_1 \cap I_2$, and since $0 \le r_{I_1\cap I_2} \le r_{I_1} + r_{I_2} - r_{I_1\cup I_2} = 0$, we must have $r_{I_1\cap I_2} = 0$ and therefore $J_1' \cap J_2' = \varnothing$. Furthermore for each i every element of J_i is in the closure of the set J_i', therefore every element of J is in the closure of J'. Thus

$$r_J = |J'| = |J_1'| + |J_2'| = r_{J_1} + r_{J_2},$$

which is the desired conclusion. □

Proposition 16.10. *Let* $I_1, \dots, I_k$ *be subsets of* A. *Then* $A = I_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus I_k$ *if and only if* $A = I_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup I_k$ *and* $r_A = r_{I_1} + \cdots + r_{I_k}$.

Proof. The "only if" direction was already done in Section 1. To prove the "if" direction, we induce on k. In view of the definition of direct sum, the case $k = 2$ is a straightforward consequence of Lemma 16.8. Thus we assume $k \ge 3$ and that the result is true for $k-1$. Let $A' = I_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup I_{k-1}$. Then $A = A' \sqcup I_k$, and we have

$$r_A \le r_{A'} + r_{I_k} \le r_{I_1} + \cdots + r_{I_k} = r_A.$$

It follows that $r_A = r_{A'} + r_{I_k}$, and that $r_{A'} = r_{I_1} + \cdots + r_{I_{k-1}}$. Since the direct sum operation is associative, our induction hypothesis concludes the proof. □

Lemma 16.11. *Let* I *and* J *be subsets of* A *such that* $A = I \oplus J$. *If* C *is a connected subset of* A *then either* $C \subseteq I$ *or* $C \subseteq J$.

Proof. Let $I' = I \cap C$ and $J' = J \cap C$. By Proposition 16.10 and Lemma 16.9 we have $r_{I'} + r_{J'} = r_{I'\cup J'} = r_C$, hence $C = I' \oplus J'$. The desired conclusion is now immediate. □

Proposition 16.12. *Let* $A_1, \dots, A_k$ *be the connected components of* A. *Then we have* $A = A_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus A_k$.

Proof. The proposition is trivially true if A is connected, hence we assume that A is not connected. Then $A = I \oplus J$ for some nonempty subsets I and J. Since each connected component of A is either inside I or inside J (by Lemma 16.11) it follows that the connected components of I together with the connected components of J give the connected components of A. An elementary induction on the size of A now completes the proof. □

References

[1] D. Bayer and B. Sturmfels, *Cellular resolutions of monomial modules*, J. Reine Angew. Math. **502** (1998), 123–140.

[2] D. Buchsbaum and D. Rim, *A generalized Koszul complex, II. Depth and multiplicity*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **111** (1964), 197–224.

[3] W. Bruns and J. Herzog, *On multigraded resolutions*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Phil. Soc. **118** (1995), 245–257.

[4] H. Charalambous, *Betti numbers of multigraded modules*, J. Algebra **137** (1991) 491–500.

[5] H. Charalambous and C. Deno, *Multigraded Modules*, New York J. Math. **7** (2001), 1–6.

[6] H. Charalambous and A. Tchernev, *Free resolutions for multigraded modules: A generalization of Taylor's construction*, Math. Res. Lett. **10** (2003), 535–550.

[7] H. Charalambous and A. Tchernev, *On the Betti numbers of multigraded modules*, in preparation.

[8] S. Iyengar, *Shifts in resolutions of multigraded modules*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **121** (1997), 437–441.

[9] J. Lescot, *Séries de Poincaré des modules multi-gradués sur les anneaux monomiaux*, Algebraic topology — rational homotopy (Louven-la-Neuve, 1986), 155-161, Lecture Notes in Math., 1318, Springer, Berlin, 1988.

[10] E. Miller, *The Alexander duality functors and local duality with monomial support*, J. Algebra **231** (2000), 180–234.

[11] J. Oxley, *Matroid Theory*, Oxford Sci. Publ., Oxford University Press, New York, 1992.

[12] T. Römer, *Generalized Alexander duality and applications*, Osaka J. Math. **38** (2001), no. 2, 469–485.

[13] T. Römer, *Bounds for Betti numbers*, J. Algebra **249** (2002), 20–37.

[14] L. Santoni, *Horrock's question for monomially graded modules* Pacific J. Math. **141** (1990), 105–124.

[15] D. Taylor, *Ideals generated by monomials in an R-sequence*, Thesis, Univ. of Chicago, 1966.

[16] A. Tchernev, *Homological properties of multigraded modules*, in preparation.

[17] W. T. Tutte, *A homotopy theorem for matroids I, II*, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. **88** (1958), 144–174.

[18] W. T. Tutte, *Introduction to the theory of matroids*, Modern Anal. Comp. Methods in Sci. and Math., American Elsevier Publishing Company, New York, 1971.

[19] D. J. A. Welsh, *Matroid Theory*, L. M. S. Monographs **8**, Academic Press, London–New York, 1976.

[20] K. Yanagawa, *Alexander duality for Stanley-Reisner rings and squarefree* $\mathbb{N}^n$*-graded modules*, J. Algebra **225** (2000), 630–645.

[21] K. Yanagawa, *Bass numbers of local cohomology modules with supports in monomial ideals*, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **131** (2001), 45–60.

[22] K. Yanagawa, *Derived category of squarefree modules and local cohomology with monomial support*, J. Math. Soc. Japan **56** (2004), 289–308.

Department of Mathematics, University at Albany, SUNY, Albany, NY 12222
E-mail address: `tchernev@math.albany.edu`